



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

नं० 37]
No. 37]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, सितम्बर 11, 1999/चैत्र 20, 1921
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1999/BHADRA 20, 1921

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II) PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (II)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 27 अगस्त, 1999

का. प्रा. 2519:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा
(संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम,
1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में,
गृह मंत्रालय के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों में हिन्दी का कार्य-
साधक ज्ञान रखने वाले कर्मचारियों की संख्या 80%
से अधिक हो जाने के फलस्वरूप उन्हें एतद्वारा अधि-
सूचित करती हैं:—

1. युवा कौशल विद्यालय, उधमपुर, सी. सु. बल
2. क्षेत्रीय मुख्यालय, जम्मू, सी. सु. बल
3. 87वीं बटालियन, सी. सु. बल
4. 14वीं बटालियन, सी. सु. बल

5. सिग्नल प्रशिक्षण स्कूल-I, सी. सु. बल, टिगरी,
नई दिल्ली—110062
6. 77वीं बटालियन, सी. सु. बल
7. विधेय यंत्र कार्यशाला, सी. सु. बल
8. उप महानिरीक्षक (मुख्यालय), सी. सु. बल
9. 13वीं बटालियन, सी. सु. बल
10. 68वीं बटालियन, सी. सु. बल
11. 113वीं बटालियन, सी. सु. बल
12. 161वीं बटालियन, सी. सु. बल
13. वेतन एवं लेखा प्रभाग, सी. सु. बल।

[सं. 12017/1/99-हिन्दी]
राजेन्द्र सिंह, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 27th August, 1999

S.O. 2519.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the Ministry of Home Affairs where the percentage of Hindi knowing staff has gone above 80% :

1. Combat Training School, Udhampur.
2. Regional Headquarter, Jammu.
3. 87th Battalion, B.S.F.
4. 14th Battalion, B.S.F.
5. Signal Training School-I, B.S.F., Tigri, New Delhi-110062.
6. 77th Battalion, B.S.F.
7. Special Tools Workshop, B.S.F.
8. D. I. G. (HQ) B.S.F.
9. 13th Battalion, B.S.F.
10. 68th Battalion, B.S.F.
11. 113th Battalion, B.S.F.
12. 161st Battalion, B.S.F.
13. Pay & Account Division, B.S.F.

[No. 12017/1/99-Hindi]
RAJENDRA SINGH, Director (OL)

कार्मिक, लोक शिक्षायेत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 27 अगस्त, 1999

का.भा. 2520—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये महाराष्ट्र राज्य सरकार के गृह (विशेष) विभाग दिनांक 11-8-99 की अधिसूचना सं. एस.एस.ए.-1099/91-एसपीएल-4 द्वारा प्राप्त महाराष्ट्र राज्य सरकार की सहमति से डी.सी.बी.सी. आई.डी. मुम्बई, महाराष्ट्र में दर्ज मामला सं. 34/99 दिनांक 12-7-99 के संबंध में सरकारी गुप्ति अधिनियम, 1923 (अधिनियम सं. 19, 1923) की धारा 3 और 9 और भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 120 बी के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों तथा उपर्युक्त अपराधों से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्नों, बुद्धेरणों और षड्यंत्रों तथा उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किये गये अथवा उन्हीं तथ्य अथवा तथ्यों से उद्भूत किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिये दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य पर करती है।

[सं. 228/61/99-ग.बी.डी.-II(i)]

हरी सिंह, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSION

(Department of Personnel and Training)

New Delhi, the 27th August, 1999

S.O. 2520.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of sec. 5 read with Sec. 6 of the Delhi Spl. Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the Government of Maharashtra, vide Government of Maharashtra, Home Department (Special) Notification No. SSA-1099/91/SPL-4 dated 11th August, 1999, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Maharashtra for investigation of offences punishable under Sections 3 and 9 of the Official Secrets Act, 1923 (Act No. 19 of 1923) and Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) and abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction, or arising out of the same fact or facts in regard to the case Cr. No. 34/99 dated 12th June, 1999, registered with DCB, CID at Mumbai, Maharashtra.

[No. 228/61/99-AVD.II(i)]

हरी सिंह, अवर सचिव

नई दिल्ली, 27 अगस्त, 1999

का.भा. 2521—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये महाराष्ट्र राज्य सरकार के गृह (विशेष) विभाग दिनांक 11-8-99 की अधिसूचना सं. एस.एस.ए.-1099/91-एसपीएल-4 द्वारा प्राप्त महाराष्ट्र राज्य सरकार की सहमति से सहकर नगर, पूणे, महाराष्ट्र पुलिस स्टेशन में दर्ज मामला सं. 133/99 दिनांक 14-7-99 के संबंध में सरकारी गुप्ति अधिनियम, 1923 (अधिनियम सं. 19, 1923) की धारा 3 और 9 और भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 120-बी के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों तथा उपर्युक्त अपराधों से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्नों, बुद्धेरणों और षड्यंत्रों तथा उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किये गये अथवा उन्हीं तथ्य अथवा तथ्यों से उद्भूत किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिये दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य पर करती है।

[सं. 228/61/99-ग.बी.डी.-II(ii)]

हरी सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th August, 1999

S.O. 2521.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the Government of Maharashtra, vide Government of Maharashtra, Home Department (Special) Notification No. SSA-1099/91/SPL-4 dated 11th August, 1999, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Maharashtra for investigation of offences punishable under Sections 3 and 9 of the Official Secrets Act, 1923 (Act No. 19 of 1923) and Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) and abetments and conspiracies in relation to, or in connection with the said offences and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the

same fact or facts in regard to the case Cr. No. 133/99 dated 14th June, 1999 registered with Police Station, Sahakar Nagar, at Pune, Maharashtra.

[No. 228/61/99-AVD.II(ii)]
HARI SINGH, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2522.—सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारियों के रैंक के समकक्ष अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ सम्पदा अधिकारियों के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी परिसरों के संबंध में उसके क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा सम्पदा अधिकारी को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेंगे और उसके अधीन उस पर अधिरोपित कर्णव्यों का निर्वहन करेंगे।

सारणी

अधिकारियों का पदनाम सरकारी परिसरों की श्रेणियाँ और क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाएँ

(1)

(2)

उप-महाप्रबन्धक, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक नोट मुद्रण लिमिटेड, मैसूर, कर्नाटक उसके द्वारा अथवा उसके निमित्त कर्नाटक राज्य में मैसूर में पट्टे पर लिए गए परिसर।

उप-महाप्रबन्धक, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक नोट मुद्रण लिमिटेड, सालबोनी उसके द्वारा या उसके निमित्त पश्चिमी बंगाल राज्य में जिला मिदनापुर, सालबोनी में पट्टे पर लिए गए परिसर।

[सं. एफ. 3/60/98-करेंसी-II] (एन.एन.पी.)]
वी. के. वेलुकुट्टी, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 10th August, 1999

S.O.2522.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971, the Central Government hereby appoints the officers mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being officers equivalent to the rank of gazetted officers of the Government, to be Estate Officers for the purpose of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on Estate Officer by or under the said Act within the local limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of the Officers	Categories of Public Premises and Local limits of Jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Deputy General Manager, Bhartiya Reserve Bank Note Mudran Limited, Mysore, Karnataka.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Bhartiya Reserve Bank Note Mudran Limited at Mysore, in the State of Karnataka.
Deputy General Manager, Bhartiya Reserve Bank Note Mudran Limited, Salboni, District—Midnapore, West Bengal.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Bhartiya Reserve Bank Note Mudran Limited at Salboni, District Midnapore, in the State of West Bengal.

[No. F.3/60/98-CY. II (NNP)]
V.K. VELUKUTTY, Under Secy.

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)
नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 1999

5. यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया	01
6. कारपोरेशन बैंक	01
7. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला	01

योग : 183

का.मा. 2523:—बैंकों और वित्तीय संस्थाओं को शोध ऋणों की वसूली अधिनियम, 1993 (1993 का 51) की धारा 9 के साथ पठित धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री ए.बी. मुखर्जी न्यायाधीश (सेवानिवृत्त), उच्च न्यायालय कलकत्ता को उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख अर्थात् 6 अगस्त, 1999 से पांच वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा 65 वर्ष की आयु होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, ऋण वसूली अधिकरण कलकत्ता के पीठासीन अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 33/2/99-डी आर टी]
अनूप मिश्र, संयुक्त सचिव

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 10th August, 1999

S.O. 2523.—In pursuance of the powers conferred by Sub-Section 1 of Section 8 read with Section 9 of the Recovery of Debts due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 (51 of 1993), the Central Govt. hereby appoints Sh. A. B. Mukherjee, Judge (Retired), High Court of Calcutta as Presiding Officer of Debts Recovery Appellate Tribunal, Calcutta for a period of five years from the date on which he enters upon his office i.e. on 6th August, 1999 or till he attains the age of 65 years whichever event occurs earlier.

[F. No. 33/2/99-DRT]
ANOOP MISHRA, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.मा. 2524.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में, संलग्न अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित बैंकों के सूचीबद्ध कार्यालयों/शाखाओं को, जिनके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :-

क्रम सं.	बैंक का नाम	कार्यालयों/शाखाओं की सं.
1.	सिंडिकेट बैंक	59
2.	इलाहाबाद बैंक	44
3.	पंजाब एण्ड सिंध बैंक	69
4.	पंजाब नेशनल बैंक	08

[फा.सं. 1101/6/2/99-हिन्दी]
रमेश बाबू अणियेरी, उप-निदेशक (राजभाषा)
अनुबन्ध

नियम 10(4) के अंतर्गत अधिसूचित की जाने वाली शाखाएं/
कार्यालय

सिंडिकेट बैंक

1. सिंडिकेट बैंक
जंगेठी शाखा,
ग्राम व पो. जंगेठी
ब्लाक रोहता, मेरठ-250341
उत्तर प्रदेश

2. सिंडिकेट बैंक
काठा शाखा,
ब्लाक खेकड़ा
तहसील बागपत,
मेरठ-250609
उत्तर प्रदेश

3. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पखरपुर शाखा,
खेकड़ा ब्लाक
मेरठ-201101,
उत्तर प्रदेश

4. सिंडिकेट बैंक
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय,
लाइट हाउस हिल रोड,
हम्पनकट्टा, मंगलूर-575001
कर्नाटक

5. सिंडिकेट बैंक
सधु उद्योग शाखा,
बलमट्टा रोड,
हम्पनकट्टा, मंगलूर-575001
कर्नाटक

6. सिंडिकेट बैंक
अड्डगढ़े शाखा,
श्री बिल्डिंग मेन रोड अड्डगढ़े-577177,
चिकमंगलूर जिला
कर्नाटक

- | | |
|--|--|
| 7. सिडिकेट बैंक
येनेकल शाखा,
पुत्तूर सुब्रमन्य रोड,
येनेकल-574238
दक्षिण कन्नड जिला
कर्नाटक | 17. सिडिकेट बैंक
कालिया शाखा,
पोस्ट गेरुकट्टे,
कालिया-574293
बेलतंगडी तालुक
कर्नाटक |
| 8. सिडिकेट बैंक
कावलपट्टूर बोगगा शाखा,
मेन रोड, कावलपट्टूर बोगगा-574265
कर्नाटक | 18. सिडिकेट बैंक
कन्याना शाखा
सरकारी जूनियर कॉलेज के सामने,
कन्याना-574279
कर्नाटक |
| 9. सिडिकेट बैंक
गडिगेश्वर शाखा,
पोस्ट मेगरमक्की गिरिनाग काम्प्लेक्स
गडिगेश्वर-577112
कर्नाटक | 19. सिडिकेट बैंक
जोक्कट्टे शाखा
भ्राह्मा कॉम्प्लेक्स,
जोक्कट्टे-574173
कर्नाटक |
| 10. सिडिकेट बैंक
पंजा शाखा,
मेन रोड, पंजा-574232
कर्नाटक | 20. सिडिकेट बैंक
सालेतूर शाखा,
पाणेमंगलूर-पुत्तूर रोड,
सालेतूर-574323
कर्नाटक |
| 11. सिडिकेट बैंक
काटिपल्ला शाखा,
मेन रोड, काटिपल्ला-574149
कर्नाटक | 21. सिडिकेट बैंक
बसरिकट्टे शाखा,
सल्दाना भावन, मेन रोड
बसरिकट्टे-577114
कर्नाटक |
| 12. सिडिकेट बैंक
पुत्तूर मार्केट यार्ड शाखा,
मार्केट यार्ड, पुत्तूर-574201
कर्नाटक | 22. सिडिकेट बैंक
कार्कल शाखा,
डा. पे. सं. 10, कार्कल-574104
कर्नाटक |
| 13. सिडिकेट बैंक
पुंजालकट्टे शाखा,
कृष्णा कृपा, पहली मंजिल
मेन रोड, पुंजालकट्टे-574233
कर्नाटक | 23. सिडिकेट बैंक
कडेकार शाखा
राजगोपालाकृष्ण राय रोड,
कडेकार-576104
कर्नाटक |
| 14. सिडिकेट बैंक
मुत्तिनकोप्पा शाखा,
टी एम रोड,
मुत्तिनकोप्पा-577134
कर्नाटक | 24. सिडिकेट बैंक
कुराडी हनेहल्ली शाखा,
कुराडी-576210
कर्नाटक |
| 15. सिडिकेट बैंक
सुरत्कल शाखा,
गीत महल, मेनरोड
डा. पे. सं. 4
सुरत्कल-574158
कर्नाटक | 25. सिडिकेट बैंक
कल्लमुंडकूर शाखा,
मेन रोड, कल्लमुंडकूर-574272
कर्नाटक |
| 16. सिडिकेट बैंक
चिकमंगलूर शाखा
इंदिरा गांधी रोड,
डा. पे. सं. 16, चिकमंगलूर-577101
कर्नाटक | 26. सिडिकेट बैंक
कोक्कर्ण शाखा,
मेन रोड, मंदिर के पास
कोक्कर्ण-576234
कर्नाटक |

27. सिडिकेट बैंक
कोटेश्वर शाखा;
नअता मेन रोड,
कोटेश्वर-576222
कर्नाटक
28. सिडिकेट बैंक
कुंदापुर मुख्य शाखा,
शेप शेड बिल्डिंग,
डा. पे. सं. 10, कुंदापुर-576201
कर्नाटक
29. सिडिकेट बैंक
कांजरकट्टे शाखा,
ग्लोरिया बिल्डिंग,
कांजरकट्टे-574139
कर्नाटक
30. सिडिकेट बैंक
कुंदापुर न्यू मार्केट यार्ड शाखा,
न्यू मार्केट यार्ड,
कुंदापुर-576201
कर्नाटक
31. सिडिकेट बैंक
कुंदापुर बडेरहोल्ली शाखा;
भंडारकार्य कालेज कैम्पस,
बडेरहोल्ली, कुंदापुर-576201;
कर्नाटक
32. सिडिकेट बैंक
बिदकलकट्टे शाखा,
श्री सत्यनारायण बिल्डिंग,
बिदकलकट्टे-576279
कर्नाटक
33. सिडिकेट बैंक
मूडबिदरी शाखा,
मुडबिदरी-574227
कर्नाटक
34. सिडिकेट बैंक
नंदिकूर शाखा
एम.एम.टी.पी. प्रोजेक्ट एरिया,
श्री राम टेम्पल बिल्डिंग,
नंदिकूर-574138
कर्नाटक
35. सिडिकेट बैंक
निट्टे शाखा,
निट्टे एजुकेशन ट्रस्ट काम्प्लेक्स
निट्टे-574110, कर्नाटक
36. सिडिकेट बैंक
पडुबित्र शाखा, मेन रोड,
पडुबित्र-574111
कर्नाटक
37. सिडिकेट बैंक
पेडूर शाखा, मेन रोड,
पेडूर-576124
कर्नाटक
38. सिडिकेट बैंक
सालिग्राम शाखा;
डा. पे. सं. 1 मेन रोड,
सालिग्राम-576225
कर्नाटक
39. सिडिकेट बैंक
शिर्वा शाखा;
मेन रोड, शिर्वा-574116
कर्नाटक
40. सिडिकेट बैंक
शंकरनारायण शाखा;
शंकरनारायण-576227
कर्नाटक
41. सिडिकेट बैंक
तेल्लार शाखा;
तेल्लार-576117
कर्नाटक
42. सिडिकेट बैंक
उडुपि ब्रह्मगिरि शाखा
ब्रह्मगिरि, उडुपि-576101
कर्नाटक
43. सिडिकेट बैंक
उद्यावर शाखा,
मेन रोड, उद्यावर-574116
कर्नाटक
44. सिडिकेट बैंक
हैदराबाद अशोक नगर शाखा,
1-1-300/बी, मेन रोड
अशोक नगर, हैदराबाद-500020
(आन्ध्र प्रदेश)
45. सिडिकेट बैंक
हैदराबाद बोराबंडा शाखा,
बालाजी एस्टेट्स;
1-171 सी, स्नेहपुरी कालोनी,
मेन रोड बोराबंडा
हैदराबाद-500018
(आन्ध्र प्रदेश)
46. सिडिकेट बैंक
हैदराबाद चिक्कडपल्ली शाखा,
आर.टी.सी. ग्राम रोड,
पो. नं. रां. 1809
चिक्कडपल्ली, हैदराबाद-500020
(आन्ध्र प्रदेश)

47. सिडिकेट बैंक
हैदराबाद एम. जे. रोड शाखा,
5-4-413/415 नामपल्ली,
मुकरमजाही रोड,
हैदराबाद-500001
(आन्ध्र प्रदेश)
48. सिडिकेट बैंक
विशाखापट्टनम मुख्य शाखा,
पवन कार्मिशियल काम्प्लेक्स
प्रथम व द्वितीय तल,
क. सं. 30-15-141, मेन रोड,
शाबा गार्डन्स डा. पे. सं. 2021
विशाखापट्टनम -530020
(आन्ध्र प्रदेश)
49. सिडिकेट बैंक
शिरूर शाखा;
सूर्य प्रकाश निलय,
मंडल पंचायत कार्यालय के सामने;
किन्हुल द्वारा शिरूर-583230
रायचूर जिला;
कर्नाटक
50. सिडिकेट बैंक
कुण्टगी शाखा,
कंदकूर बिल्डिंग,
दलाल बाजार, कुण्टगी-584121
कर्नाटक
51. सिडिकेट बैंक
चिरतेगुडु शाखा,
मंडल पंचायत बिल्डिंग,
चिक्कजोगिहल्ली द्वारा चिरतेगुडु-583126
कर्नाटक
52. सिडिकेट बैंक
तुंगभद्रा डैम शाखा,
ग्रोट्ट टैलीफोन एक्सचेंज बिल्डिंग,
पोस्ट आफिस रोड,
टी.बी. डैम-583225
कर्नाटक
53. सिडिकेट बैंक
हैदराबाद जे एन एस शाखा;
क. सं. 1-7-23/8; जय संतोषी नगर कॉलोनी;
हबसीगुडा, गली नं. 6,
हैदराबाद-500007 (आ. प्र.)
54. सिडिकेट बैंक
ऐमंगला शाखा,
ऐमंगला-577588
कर्नाटक

55. सिडिकेट बैंक
गंगावती शाखा,
डा. पे. सं. 13, निगमुगूर रोड,
गंगावती-583227
कर्नाटक
56. सिडिकेट बैंक
संडूर शाखा,
बल्लारी कूडलगी रोड
संडूर-583119
कर्नाटक
57. सिडिकेट बैंक
गोवा मकसाना शाखा;
पंचायत घर बिल्डिंग
गोवा-403709
58. सिडिकेट बैंक
गोवा वास्को डि गामा शाखा;
म्युनिमिपल मार्केट के पास
गोवा-403802
59. सिडिकेट बैंक
प्रधान कार्यालय;
डाक पेटी सं. 1;
मणिपाल-576119
उडुपी जिला
कर्नाटक

नियम 10(4) के अंतर्गत अधिसूचित की जाने वाली
शाखाओं के नाम/पता की सूची

इलाहाबाद बैंक

1. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
सेवा शाखा, जयपुर
एम-5, जनता कॉलोनी,
जयपुर-303004
2. इलाहाबाद बैंक
बीकानेर रोड,
सूरतगढ़ (राज.)
जिला - श्री गंगानगर
3. इलाहाबाद बैंक
मगध स्टॉक एक्सचेंज शाखा
तृतीय तल,
आशियाना प्लाजा,
बुद्ध मार्ग, पटना-800001
4. इलाहाबाद बैंक
सेक्टर-4, शाखा (श.)
बोकारो स्टील सिटी,
जिला-बोकारो (बिहार)

5. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
गुरु गोविन्द रोड, शाखा (अ.श.);
गुरु गोविन्द सिंह रोड,
हजारी बाग-815301 (बिहार)
6. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
रांची मुख्य शाखा (श.)
मेन रोड,
रांची-834001 (बिहार)
7. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
स्टाफ कॉलेज,
सक्टर-21, रिंग रोड,
इंदिरा नगर,
लखनऊ-226016
8. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
खुरजा शाखा,
(निकट श्री नवबुर्गा मन्दिर),
सिद्धेश्वर मार्ग, खुरजा,
बुलन्दशहर-203131
उत्तर प्रदेश
9. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
लघु उद्योग वित्त शाखा,
“रिठारिवा कॉम्प्लेक्स”
सेमरिया चौक,
सतना-485001
10. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय,
बिलासपुर, ईदगाह चौक,
पुलिस लाइन के सामने,
बिलासपुर-495001
(मध्य प्रदेश)
11. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
करेन्सी चेस्ट,
ईदगाह चौक,
पुलिस लाइन के सामने,
बिलासपुर-495001
(मध्य प्रदेश)
12. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा,
18, बड़ा सराफा,
इन्दौर (म. प्र.)
13. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
अवलपुर चौधरी शाखा,
डाक-काइथी लिया
जिला गौण्डा
14. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
बिशनपुर टनटनवा शाखा,
पोस्ट बिशनपुर टनटनवा,
जिला-गौण्डा
15. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
बैजलपुर शाखा,
डाक-बैजलपुर,
जिला-गौण्डा
16. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
चन्दापुर शाखा,
डाक-चन्दापुर
जिला-गौण्डा
17. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
चन्ददीप घाट शाखा,
डाक-चन्ददीप घाट,
जिला-गौण्डा
18. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
बूल्हापुर शाखा,
डाक-धानेपुर,
जिला-गौण्डा
19. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
दीलतपुर शाखा,
डाक-सीतारामपुर ग्रंट,
जिला-गौण्डा
20. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
देवताहा शाखा,
डाक-देवताहा,
जिला-गौण्डा
21. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
धीरहराघाट शाखा,
डाक-धीरहराघाट,
जिला-गौण्डा
22. इलाहाबाद बैंक
ग्वालियर ग्रंट शाखा
डाक-दतौली,
जिला-गौण्डा
23. इलाहाबाद बैंक
हटई रामपुर शाखा,
डाक-गैडास बुजुर्ग
जिला-गौण्डा
24. इलाहाबाद बैंक
इमिलिया शाखा,
डाक-उतरोला,
जिला-गौण्डा
25. इलाहाबाद बैंक
कठुव्या शाखा,
डाक-भोपालपुर
जिला-गौण्डा

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>26. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
कटुआनाला शाखा,
डाक-बुभा बाजार,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>27. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
कृतवर्ग शाखा,
डाक-उज्ज्वनी कला,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>28. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
कण्डेला शाखा,
डाक-बादलपुर,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>29. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
लोकहवा शाखा-
डाक-लोकहवा,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>30. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
मातदा शाखा,
डाक-धवाई,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>31. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
मतवरिया शाखा,
डाक-अलावल देवरिया,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>32. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
रामनगर शाखा,
डाक-मोतीपुर (गिबपुरा),
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>33. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
रामपुर अरना शाखा,
डाक-रामपुर ग्रंट,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>34. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
शीतलगज शाखा,
डाक-मसकनवा,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>35. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
शाहपुर धनवा शाखा,
डाक-धनवा,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>36. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
तिल्का शाखा,
डाक-तिल्काडीह,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>37. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
तुर्काडीह शाखा,
डाक-वजीरगज,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> | <p>38. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
रानीपुर शाखा,
डाक-तरवगज,
जिला-गोण्डा</p> <p>39. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
कैथल शाखा,
(बस स्टैंड के पास)-
हरियाणा-132027</p> <p>40. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
जींद शाखा,
रानी ताबाब, जींद,
हरियाणा-126102</p> <p>41. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
फाजिल्का शाखा,
गोशाला रोड, फाजिल्का,
जिला-फिरोजपुर,
पंजाब-152123</p> <p>42. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
राजपुरा शाखा,
कैलिबर मार्केट,
एल्फस सिनेमा के सामने,,
राजपुरा, पंजाब-140401</p> <p>43. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
फतेहाबाद शाखा,
जी.टी. रोड, फतेहाबाद,
हरियाणा-125050</p> <p>44. इलाहाबाद बैंक,
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, हैदराबाद,
हिमायतनगर में रोड,
हैदराबाद-29</p> |
|--|--|
- राजभाषा नियम 10(4) में अभिसूचित करने हेतु
शाखाओं/कार्यालयों की सूची
- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| <p>2564 GI/99-2.</p> | <p>1. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
स्टाफ प्रशिक्षण महाविद्यालय,
513/36-बी,
चण्डीगढ़।</p> <p>2. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
भाषाई कार्यालय (चण्डीगढ़)
मैकटर-17 बी,
चण्डीगढ़।</p> <p>3. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
भाषाई कार्यालय,
माडल टाउन,
जालंधर।</p> |
|----------------------|--|

4. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
ग्रामलिक कार्यालय,
हाल बाजार,
अमृतसर ।
5. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
बटाला रोड,
अमृतसर ।
6. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
भगतावाला गेट,
अमृतसर ।
7. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
चौक पराग दास,
अमृतसर ।
8. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
सिटी सेंटर,
अमृतसर ।
9. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
सिविल लाइन्स,
12-नारैन्स रोड,
अमृतसर ।
10. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
कोर्ट रोड,
अमृतसर ।
11. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
दर्शनी डिपोडी,
अमृतसर ।
12. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
दाब बस्ती राम,
अमृतसर ।
13. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
फुतेहगढ़, चूरिआन रोड,
अमृतसर ।
14. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
स्वर्ण भविर,
अमृतसर ।
15. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
गुरुनानक देव यूनिवर्सिटी,
अमृतसर ।
16. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
इस्लामाबाद,
अमृतसर ।
17. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
खालसा कालेज,
अमृतसर ।
18. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
कोट मंगल सिंह,
अमृतसर ।
19. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
नसक मंडी,
अमृतसर ।
20. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
रेलवे रोड,
अमृतसर ।
21. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
शरीफपुरा,
अमृतसर ।
22. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
गुरु रामदास सराय,
अमृतसर ।
23. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
टूण्डा तालाब,
अमृतसर ।
24. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
मुलतानविह रोड,
अमृतसर ।
25. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
सत सुखासिंह सीनियर सैकेण्डरी स्कूल,"
बि माल, अमृतसर ।
26. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
गुरु रामदास अस्पताल,
अमृतसर ।
27. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
गुरु रामदास सराय,
अमृतसर ।
28. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
औद्योगिक बिस्व शाखा,
चौक फव्वारा, हाल बाजार,
अमृतसर ।
29. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक
विस्तार पटल,
हिन्दू सभा हायर सैकेण्डरी स्कूल,
डाब खटीक, अमृतसर ।
30. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
विस्तार पटल,
सेंट्रल खालसा ओरफेन्ज,
पुतली घर, अमृतसर ।

31. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
क्षेत्रीय बसुली केन्द्र,
चौक फठ्वारा,
अमृतसर ।
32. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
दुर्गियाना मन्दिर,
अमृतसर ।
33. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
आई बी डी, हाल बाजार,
चौक फठ्वारा,
अमृतसर ।
34. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
जोन्ल स्टेशनरी डिपार्टमेंट,
भारीकपुरा,
अमृतसर ।
35. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
करेंसी चेस्ट, हाल बाजार,
अमृतसर ।
36. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
भाई वीर सिंह विरध घर,
तरन-तारन
जिला अमृतसर ।
37. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
बट्टर कलां,
जिला अमृतसर ।
38. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक
चौला साहिब,
जिला अमृतसर ।
39. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
गोबिन्दवाल साहिब,
जिला अमृतसर ।
40. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
हरि के पत्तन,
जिला अमृतसर ।
41. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
जगदेव कलां,
जिला अमृतसर ।
42. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक
गंडियाला गुरू,
जिला अमृतसर ।
43. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
कैरों,
जिला अमृतसर ।
44. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
कालाधानपुर,
नजदीक ओसीएम,
जिला अमृतसर ।
45. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
खलचियां,
जिला अमृतसर ।
46. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
मनोचाहल,
जिला अमृतसर ।
47. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
मुधल,
जिला अमृतसर ।
48. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
मसेवाल,
जिला अमृतसर ।
49. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
नागोके,
जिला-अमृतसर ।
50. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
पट्टी,
जिला अमृतसर ।
51. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
रठ्या मंड़ी,
जिला अमृतसर ।
52. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
रामदास,
जिला अमृतसर ।
53. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
शाम नगर,
जिला अमृतसर ।
54. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
शाहबाजपुर,
जिला अमृतसर ।
55. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
शैरों,
जिला अमृतसर ।
56. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
चड्ढा कलां,
जिला अमृतसर ।
57. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
तरन तारन,
जिला अमृतसर ।
58. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
अड्डा मार्किट, वल्लोहा,
जिला अमृतसर ।

59. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
वरंगल,
जिला अमृतसर।

60. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
बडाला कलां,
जिला अमृतसर।

61. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
चक करे खान,
जिला अमृतसर।

62. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
खियाला कलां,
जिला अमृतसर।

63. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
मल्लियां,
जिला अमृतसर।

64. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
राजौरी,
जिला अमृतसर।

65. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
भिडी सैय्यवां,
जिला अमृतसर।

66. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
बल कलां,
जिला अमृतसर।

67. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
बोयाराय,
जिला अमृतसर।

68. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
श्री हरबार साहिब,
तरनतारन,
जिला अमृतसर।

69. पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक,
खड्डूर साहिब,
जिला अमृतसर।

पंजाब नेशनल बैंक

1. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शा.का. 21-1-830/4 और 10,
पटेल मार्केट, जुबली पोस्ट ऑफिस के पीछे
बारसीनार,
हैदराबाद-500 002।

2. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शा.का. 23-6-901 बी.वी.जे. रोड,
मुल्तानशाही,
हैदराबाद-500 265।

3. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
मु.शा.का. बैंक स्ट्रीट,
हैदराबाद-500 001।

4. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शा.का. एल आई सी बिल्डिंग,
4-3-381/384, बैंक स्ट्रीट,
हैदराबाद-500 001।

5. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
शा.का.जे.पी.एन. रोड,
वरंगल-506 002 (आ.प्र.)।

6. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शा.का. चिक्कडपल्ली,
हैदराबाद-500 020।

7. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शा.का.पिसल बंडा मैन रोड
कंचन बाग सैफाबाद पो.आ.
हैदराबाद-596।

8. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शा.का. भीमारम,
वरंगल-506 015 (आ.प्र.)।

यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया

1. यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया
जुबली हिल शाखा,
प्लॉट क्र. 1129, रोड क्र. 36,
माधापुर रोड, जुबली हिल,
हैदराबाद-500 033.

कार्पोरेशन बैंक

1. कार्पोरेशन बैंक,
शा.प संख्या 228 से 232,
ब्लॉक संख्या 23, कर्मशियल काम्प्लेक्स,
कामुम्टी ग्रंथल केन्द्र,
शिमला-171 009
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला

1. स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला,
स्टाफ कालेज, प्लॉट नं. 79,
सैक्टर-18, गुडगांव।

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2524.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use of official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government, hereby, notifies the listed offices/branches of the following banks in the attached annexe, more than 80% of the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi:—

S. No.	Name of the Banks	Name of Offices/Branches
1.	Syndicate Bank	59
2.	Allahabad Bank	44
3.	Punjab & Sind Bank	69
4.	Punjab National Bank	08
5.	Union Bank of India	01
6.	Corporation Bank	01
7.	State Bank of Patiala	01
Total		183

[F. No. 11016/2/99-Hindi]
RAMESH BABU ANIYERY, Dy. Director (O.L.)

ANNEXURE

Branches/Offices to be notified under Rule 10(4)
SYNDICATE BANK

1. Syndicate Bank,
Jangethi Branch,
Village & Post Jangethi,
Block Rota,
Meerut-250341,
U.P.

2. Syndicate Bank,
Katha Branch,
Block Khekra,
Teh. Baghpat,
Meerut-250009,
U.P.

3. Syndicate Bank,
Pakharpur Branch,
Khekra Block,
Meerut-201101,
U.P.

4. Syndicate Bank,
Regional Office,
Light House Hill Road,
Hampankatta,
Mangalore-575001,
Karnataka.

5. Syndicate Bank,
SSI Branch,
Balmatta Road,
Hampankatta,
Mangalore-575001,
Karnataka.

6. Syndicate Bank,
Addagadde Branch,
Sree Building,
Main Road,
Addagadde-577177,
Chickmagalore Dist.
Karnataka.

7. Syndicate Bank,
Yenekal Branch,
Puttur Subramanya Road,
Yenekal-574238,
Dakshina Kannada Dist.,
Karnataka.

8. Syndicate Bank,
Kavalpadur Vogga Branch,
Main Road,
Kavalpadur Vogga-574265,
Karnataka.

9. Syndicate Bank,
Gadigeshwar Branch,
Post Megaramakki,
Girinag Complex,
Gadigeshwar-577112,
Karnataka.

10. Syndicate Bank,
Panja Branch,
Main Road,
Panja-574232,
Karnataka.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 11. Syndicate Bank,
Katipalla Branch,
Main Road,
Katipalla-574149,
Karnataka. | 21. Syndicate Bank,
Basarikatte Branch,
Saldanha Mansions,
Main Road,
Basarikatte-577114,
Karnataka. |
| 12. Syndicate Bank,
Puttur Market Yard Branch,
Market Yard,
Puttur-574201,
Karnataka. | 22. Syndicate Bank,
Karkala Branch,
P. B. No. 10,
Karkala-574104,
Karnataka. |
| 13. Syndicate Bank,
Funjalkatte Branch,
Krishna Kripa First Floor,
Main Road,
Funjalkatte-574233,
Karnataka. | 23. Syndicate Bank,
Kadekar Branch,
Rajgopal Krishna Rao Road,
Kadekar-576104,
Karnataka. |
| 14. Syndicate Bank,
Muthinkoppa Branch,
T M Road,
Muthinkoppa-577134,
Karnataka. | 24. Syndicate Bank,
Kurady Hanehalli Branch,
Kurady-576210,
Karnataka. |
| 15. Syndicate Bank,
Suratkal Branch,
Geeth Mahal,
Main Road,
P. B. No. 4,
Suratkal-574158,
Karnataka. | 25. Syndicate Bank,
Kallamundkur Branch,
Main Road,
Kallamundkur-574272,
Karnataka. |
| 16. Syndicate Bank,
Chickmagalore Branch,
Indira Gandhi Road,
P. B. No. 16,
Chickmagalore-577101,
Karnataka. | 26. Syndicate Bank,
Kokkarne Branch,
Main Road,
Near Temple,
Kokkarne-574234,
Karnataka. |
| 17. Syndicate Bank,
Kalia Branch,
Post Gerukatte,
Kalia-574293,
Belthangadi Taluk,
Karnataka. | 27. Syndicate Bank,
Koteswar Branch,
Namratha Main Road,
Koteswar-576222,
Karnataka. |
| 18. Syndicate Bank,
Kanyana Branch,
Oppt. Govt. Junior College,
Kanyana-574279,
Karnataka. | 28. Syndicate Bank,
Kundapur Main Branch,
Shesha Shet Building,
P. B. No. 10,
Kundapur-576201,
Karnataka. |
| 19. Syndicate Bank,
Jokatte Branch,
Asma Complex,
Jokatte-574173,
Karnataka. | 29. Syndicate Bank,
Kanjarkatte Branch,
Gloria Building,
Kanjarkatte-574139,
Karnataka. |
| 20. Syndicate Bank,
Salethur Branch,
Panemangalore-puttur Road,
Salethur-574323,
Karnataka. | 30. Syndicate Bank,
Kundapur New Market Yard Branch,
New Market Yard,
Kundapur-576201,
Karnataka. |
| | 31. Syndicate Bank,
Kundapur-Vaderhobli Branch,
Bhandarkar's College Campus,
Vaderhobli,
Kundapur-576201,
Karnataka. |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>32. Syndicate Bank,
Bidkaikatte,
Sri Sathyanarayana Building,
Bidkalkatte-576276,
Karnataka.</p> <p>33. Syndicate Bank,
Moodabidri Branch,
Moodabidri-574227,
Karnataka.</p> <p>34. Syndicate Bank,
Naddikur Branch,
MSTP Project Area,
Sri Ram Temple Building,
Nandikur-574138,
Karnataka.</p> <p>35. Syndicate Bank,
Nitte Branch,
Nitte Education Trust Complex,
Nitte-574110,
Karnataka.</p> <p>36. Syndicate Bank,
Padubidri Branch,
Main Road,
Padubidri-574111,
Karnataka.</p> <p>37. Syndicate Bank,
Perdoor Branch,
Main Road,
Perdoor-576124,
Karnataka.</p> <p>38. Syndicate Bank,
Saligrama Branch,
P. B. No. 1,
Main Road,
Saligrama-576225,
Karnataka.</p> <p>39. Syndicate Bank,
Shirva Branch,
Main Road,
Shirva,-574116,
Karnataka.</p> <p>40. Syndicate Bank,
Shankaranarayana Branch,
Shankaranarayana-576227,
Karnataka.</p> <p>41. Syndicate Bank,
Tellar Branch,
Tellar-576117,
Karnataka.</p> <p>42. Syndicate Bank,
Udupi Brahmagiri Branch,
Brahmagiri Udupi-576101,
Karnataka.</p> | <p>43. Syndicate Bank,
Udyavara Branch,
Main Road,
Ddyavara-574116,
Karnataka.</p> <p>44. Syndicate Bank,
Hyderabad Ashoknagar Branch,
1-1-300/B, Main Road,
Ashoknagar,
Hyderabad-500020,
(A.P.).</p> <p>45. Syndicate Bank,
Hyderabad Borabanda Branch,
Balaji Estate,
1-171 C, Snchupuri Colony,
Main Road,
Borabanda,
Hyderabad-500018,
(A.P.).</p> <p>46. Syndicate Bank,
Hyderabad Chickkadpally Branch,
R T C Cross Road,
P. B. No. 1809,
Chickkadpally,
Hyderabad-500020,
(A.P.).</p> <p>47. Syndicate Bank,
Hyderabad M J Road Branch,
5-4-413/415 Nampally,
Mukarramjahi Road,
Hyderabad-500001,
(A.P.).</p> <p>48. Syndicate Bank,
Hyderabad JSN Colony Branch,
Door No. 1-7-23/8,
Jai Santhoshi Nagar Colony,
Habsigude, Street No. 8,
Hyderabad-500007,
(A.P.).</p> <p>49. Syndicate Bank,
Vishakapatnam Main Branch,
Pavan Commercial Complex,
I & II Floor,
Door No. 30-15-141,
Main Road,
Daba Gardens,
P. B. No. 2021,
Vishakhapatnam-530020,
(A.P.).</p> <p>50. Syndicate Bank,
Shirur Branch,
Suryaprakash Nilaya,
Opp. Mandal Panchayat Office,
Via Kinhal,
Shirur-583230,
Raichur Dist.,
Karnataka.</p> |
|--|--|

51. Syndicate Bank,
Kustagi Branch,
Kandekur Building,
Dalal Bazar,
Kustagi-584121,
Karnataka.
 52. Syndicate Bank,
Chirategundu Branch,
Mandal Panchayat Building,
Via Chikkajogihalli,
Chirategundu-583126,
Karnataka.
 53. Syndicate Bank,
Thungabhadra Dam Branch,
Old Telephone Exchange Building,
Post Office Road,
T.B. Dam-583225,
Karnataka.
 54. Syndicate Bank,
Aimangala Branch,
Aimangala-577588,
Karnataka.
 55. Syndicate Bank,
Gangavathi Branch,
P. B. No. 13,
Lingsugur Road,
Gangavathi-583227,
Karnataka.
 56. Syndicate Bank,
Sandur Branch,
Bellary Kudalgi Road,
Sandur-583116,
Karnataka.
 57. Syndicate Bank,
Goa Macasaviati Branch,
Panchayat Ghar Building,
Goa-403709.
 58. Syndicate Bank,
Goa Vasco Da Gama Branch,
Near Municipal Market,
Goa-403802.
 59. Syndicate Bank,
Head Office,
P. B. No. 1,
Manipal-576119,
Udupi Dist.,
Karnataka.
 3. Allahabad Bank,
Magadh Stock Exchange:
Branch (3rd Floor),
Ashiana Plaza,
Budh Marg,
Patna-800001.
 4. Allahabad Bank,
Sector-IV Branch (Urban),
Bokaro Steel City,
Dist. Bokaro (Bihar).
 5. Allahabad Bank,
Guru Gobind Road Branch. (SU),
Guru Gobind Singh Road,
Hazaribagh-815301,
(Bihar).
 6. Allahabad Bank,
Ranchi Main Branch (Urban),
Main Road,
Ranchi-834001,
(Bihar).
 7. Allahabad Bank,
Staff College,
Sector-21,
Ring Road,
Indiranagar,
Lucknow-226016.
 8. Allahabad Bank,
Khurja Branch,
(Near Shri Navadurga Mandir),
Sidheshwar Road,
Khurja,
Dist. Bulandsahar,
Pin-203131,
(U.P.).
 9. Allahabad Bank,
Small Scale Industrial
Finance Branch,
'Richaria Complex',
Semariya Chowk,
Satna-485001.
 10. Allahabad Bank,
Regional Office,
Bilaspur,
Iddgah Chowk,
Infront of Police Lines,
Bilaspur-495001,
Madhya Pradesh.
 11. Allahabad Bank,
Currency Chest,
Bilaspur,
Iddgah Chowk,
Infront of Police Lines,
Bilaspur-495001,
Madhya Pradesh.
- ALLAHABAD BANK
1. Allahabad Bank (Service Branch),
S-5, Janta Colony,
Jaipur,
Jaipur-302004.
 2. Allahabad Bank
Bikaner Road,
Suratgarh (Raj).
Dist. Sri Ganganagar.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 12. Allahabad Bank,
Personal Banking Branch,
18, Bara Sarafa,
Indore,
(M.P.). | 25. Allahabad Bank,
Kathuwa Branch,
P. O. Bhopalpur,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 13. Allahabad Bank,
Achalpur Chaudhary Branch,
P. O. Katholia,
Dist. Gonda. | 26. Allahabad Bank,
Katuwanala Branch,
P. O. Dubha Bazar,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 14. Allahabad Bank,
Bishunpur Tantanwa Branch,
P. O. Bishunpur,
Tantanwa,
Dist. Gonda. | 27. Allahabad Bank,
Kutubganj Branch,
P. O. Ujaini Kala,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 15. Allahabad Bank,
Baijalpur Branch,
P. O. Baijalpur,
Dist. Gonda. | 28. Allahabad Bank,
Kandela Branch,
P. O. Badalpur,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 16. Allahabad Bank,
Chandapur Branch,
P. O. Chandapur,
Dist. Gonda. | 29. Allahabad Bank,
Laukahawa Branch,
P. O. Laukahawa,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 17. Allahabad Bank,
Chanddeep Ghat,
P. O. Chanddeep Ghat,
Dist. Gonda. | 30. Allahabad Bank,
Malda Branch,
P. O. Dhavai,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 18. Allahabad Bank,
Dullhapur Branch,
P. O. Dhaneypur,
Dist. Gonda. | 31. Allahabad Bank,
Matwaria Branch,
P. O. Alavai Devra,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 19. Allahabad Bank,
Daulatpur Branch,
P. O. Sitarampur Grant,
Dist. Gonda. | 32. Allahabad Bank,
Ramnagar Branch,
P. O. Motipur (Shivpura),
Dist. Gonda. |
| 20. Allahabad Bank,
Devtaha Branch,
P. O. Devtaha,
Dist. Gonda. | 33. Allahabad Bank,
Rampur Arna Branch,
P. O. Rampur Grant,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 21. Allahabad Bank,
Dhaurharaghat Branch,
P. O. Dhaurharaghat,
Dist. Gonda. | 34. Allahabad Bank,
Seetalganj Branch,
P. O. Maskanwa,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 22. Allahabad Bank,
Gwalior Grant Branch,
P. O. Datauli,
Dist. Gonda. | 35. Allahabad Bank,
Shahpur Dhanawa Branch,
P. O. Dhanwa,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 23. Allahabad Bank,
Itairampur Branch,
P. O. Gendas Buzurag,
Dist. Gonda. | 36. Allahabad Bank,
Tilka Branch,
P. O. Tilkadeeha,
Dist. Gonda. |
| 24. Allahabad Bank,
Imilia Branch,
P. O. Utraulla,
Dist. Gonda. | 37. Allahabad Bank,
Turkadeeha Branch,
P. O. Wazir Ganj,
Dist. Gonda. |
| | 38. Allahabad Bank,
Ranipur Branch,
P. O. Tarabganj,
Dist. Gonda. |

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>39. Allahabad Bank,
Kaithal Branch,
(Near Bus Stand),
P. O. Kaithal,
Haryana-132027.</p> <p>40. Allahabad Bank,
Jind Branch,
Rani Talab,
Jind,
Haryana-125102.</p> <p>41. Allahabad Bank,
Fazilka Branch,
Gausala Road,
Fazilka,
Dist. Ferozpur,
Punjab-152123.</p> <p>42. Allahabad Bank,
Rajpura Branch,
Calibre Market,
Opp. Alapse Cinema,
Rajpura,
Punjab-140401.</p> <p>43. Allahabad Bank,
Fatehabad Branch,
G. T. Road,
Fatehabad,
Haryana-125050.</p> <p>44. Allahabad Bank,
Regional Office,
Hyderabad,
Himayatnagar Main Road,
Hyderabad-29.</p> | <p>7. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Chowk Prag Dass,
Amritsar.</p> <p>8. Punjab & Sind Bank,
City Centre,
Amritsar.</p> <p>9. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Civil Lines,
12-Lawrence Road,
Amritsar.</p> <p>10. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Court Road,
Amritsar.</p> <p>11. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Darshani Deori,
Amritsar.</p> <p>12. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Dhab Wasti Ram,
Amritsar.</p> <p>13. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Fatehgarh Churians Road,
Amritsar.</p> <p>14. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Golden Temple,
Amritsar.</p> <p>15. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Guru Nanak Dev University,
Amritsar.</p> <p>16. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Islamabad,
Amritsar.</p> |
|--|---|

PUNJAB & SIND BANK

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Staff Training College,
Punjab & Sind Bank,
513/36-B,
Chandigarh.</p> <p>2. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Zonal Office (Chandigarh),
Sector-17B,
Chandigarh.</p> <p>3. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Zonal Office,
Model Town,
Jalandhar.</p> <p>4. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Zonal Office,
Hall Bazar,
Amritsar.</p> <p>5. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Batala Road,
Amritsar.</p> <p>6. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Bhagtanwala Gate,
Amritsar.</p> | <p>17. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Khalsa College,
Amritsar.</p> <p>18. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Kot Mangal Singh,
Amritsar.</p> <p>19. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Nimak Mandi,
Amritsar.</p> <p>20. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Railway Road,
Amritsar.</p> <p>21. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Sharief Pura,
Amritsar.</p> <p>22. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Guru Ram Dass Sarain,
Amritsar.</p> <p>23. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Tunda Talab,
Amritsar.</p> |
|--|--|

- | | |
|---|--|
| 24. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Sultanwind Road,
Amritsar. | 39. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Govindwal Sahib,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 25. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Sant Sukh Singh Sr. Sec. School,
The Mall,
Amritsar. | 40. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Hari Ke Pattan,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 26. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Guru Ram Dass Hospital,
Amritsar. | 41. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Jagdev Kalan,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 27. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Guru Ram Dass Sarain,
Amritsar. | 42. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Jandiala Guru,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 28. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Industrial Finance Branch,
Chowk Phawara Hall Bazar,
Amritsar. | 43. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Kairon,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 29. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Hindu Sabha Hr. Sec. School,
Dab Khatika,
Amritsar. | 44. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Kalaghanpur,
Near OCM,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 30. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Central Khalsa Orphanage,
Putlighar,
Amritsar. | 45. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Khalchian,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 31. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Regional Collection Centre,
Chowk Phawara,
Amritsar. | 46. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Manochal,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 32. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Durgiana Mandir,
Amritsar. | 47. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Mudhal,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 33. Punjab & Sind Bank,
IBD, Hall Bazar,
Chowk Phawara,
Amritsar. | 48. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Mattewal,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 34. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Zonal Stationery Deptt.,
Sharifpura,
Amritsar. | 49. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Nagoke,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 35. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Currency Chest,
Hall Bazar,
Amritsar. | 50. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Patti,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 36. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Bhai Vir Singh Bridghar,
Taran Taran,
Distt. Amritsar. | 51. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Rayya Mandi,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 37. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Butter Kalan,
Distt. Amritsar. | 52. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Ramdass,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| 38. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Cholla Sahib,
Distt. Amritsar. | 53. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Shamnagar,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| | 54. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Shabhajpur,
Distt. Amritsar. |
| | 55. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Sheron,
Distt. Amritsar. |

56. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Chahal Kalan,
Distt. Amritsar.

UNION BANK OF INDIA

The Branch recommended for notification under
O.L. Rule 10(4).

57. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Taran Taran,
Distt. Amritsar.

1. Union Bank of India,
Jubilee Hills Branch,
Plot No. 1129,
Road No. 36,
Madhapur Road,
Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad 500033.

58. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Adda Market,
Vallaha,
Distt. Amritsar.

59. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Verpal,
Distt. Amritsar.

STATE BANK OF PATIALA

60. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Wadala Kalan,
Distt. Amritsar.

1. State Bank of Patiala,
Staff College
Plot No. 79,
Sector-18,
Gurgaon.

61. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Chak Kare Khan
Distt. Amritsar.

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK

62. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Khiala Kalan,
Distt. Amritsar.

1. Punjab National Bank,
BO : 21-1-820 & 10 Patel Market,
Behind Jubilee Post Office,
Charminar,
Hyderabad-500002.

63. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Mallian,
Distt. Amritsar.

2. Punjab National Bank,
BO : 23-6-9015 V.V.J. Road,
Sultanshahi,
Hyderabad-500265.

64. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Rajoke,
Distt. Amritsar.

3. Punjab National Bank,
CMO : Bank Street,
Hyderabad-500001.

65. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Bh'ndi Saidan,
Distt. Amritsar.

4. Punjab National Bank,
BO : L.L.C. Building,
4-3-331/384 Bank Street,
Hyderabad.

66. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Bal Kalan,
Distt. Amritsar.

5. Punjab National Bank,
BO : J.P.N. Road,
Warangal-506002.

67. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Boparai,
Distt. Amritsar.

6. Punjab National Bank,
BO : Chikkadapally,
Hyderabad-500020

68. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Darbar Sahib,
Taran Taran,
Distt. Amritsar.

7. Punjab National Bank,
BO : Pisal Banda Main Road,
Kanchanbagh,
Saifabad,
P.O. Hyderabad-59.

69. Punjab & Sind Bank,
Khadoor Sahib,
Distt. Amritsar.

8. Punjab National Bank,
BO : Bheemaram,
Warangal 506015,
(A.P.).

CORPORATION BANK

1. Corporation Bank,
Shop No. 228 to 232,
Block No. 23,
Commercial Complex,
Kasumpti Zonal Centre,
Shimla-171009,
Himachal Pradesh.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2525.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) रकम, 1970 के खण्ड 3 के उप खण्ड (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन एवं अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खण्ड (ड) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री ए. शशिकान्त, विशेष सहायक, केनरा बैंक, बी. वी. पुरम शाखा, बंगलौर को दिनांक 25-8-99 से 24-8-2002 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए, या जब तक वे केनरा बैंक के एक कर्मचारी के रूप में अपनी सेवा छोड़ नहीं देते हैं, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केनरा बैंक के निदेशक बोर्ड में निदेशक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. 15/3/99-आर्.आर.]

अरुण चन्द्र, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th August, 1999

S.O. 2525.—In pursuance of clause (c) of Sub-Section (3) of Section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970 read with Sub-Clause (1) of Clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. Shashikant, Special Assistant, Canara Bank, V. V. Puram Branch, Bangalore as a Director on the Board of Directors of Canara Bank for a period of three years with effect from 25-8-1999 to 24-8-2002 or until he ceases to be a Workmen Employee of Canara Bank, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 15/3/99MR]

ARUN CHANDRA, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2526.—बैंकों और वित्तीय संस्थाओं को संबंधित अधिनियम, 1993 (1993 का 51) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों के अनुसरण में और पांच वर्षों की अवधि के पूरा होने पर, जिला एवं सत्र न्यायाधीश, सीकर और फिरोजहाल डी. आर. टी., जयपुर के पीठासीन अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यरत श्री अनूप चन्द गोयल की सेवाएं 26 अगस्त, 1999 के अपराहन में राजस्थान उच्च न्यायालय, जोधपुर को वापस सौंपी जाती हैं।

[फा. सं. 19/5/95-डी.आर.टी.]

जी. आर. सुमन, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2526.—In pursuance of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Recovery of Debts due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 (51 of 1993) and on completion of five years term the services of Sh. Anoop Chand Goel, District &

Sessions Judge, Sikar and presently working as Presiding Officer, DRT, Jaipur are placed back at the disposal of High Court of Rajasthan, Jodhpur w.e.f. the afternoon of 26th August, 1999.

[F. No. 19/5/95-DRT]

G. R. SUMAN, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2527.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 को उपधारा 1 उपबन्ध सरकारी राजपत्र में हम अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2003 तक मुजफ्फरपुर मैन्यूअल को-ऑपरेटिव बैंक लि., मुजफ्फरपुर (बिहार) पर लागू नहीं होंगे

[फा. सं. 1(18)/99-ए.सी.]

एस. के. ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2527.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulations Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Muzaffarpur Central Cooperative Bank Ltd., Muzaffarpur (Bihar) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31 March, 2003.

[F. No. 1(18)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2528.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 को उपधारा 1 के उपबन्ध सरकारी राजपत्र में हम अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2000 तक दि. एटा डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैन्यूअल को-ऑपरेटिव बैंक लि., एटा (उत्तर प्रदेश) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा. सं. 1(19)/99-ए.सी.]

एस. के. ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2528.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulations Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to The Etah District Central Cooperative Bank Ltd., Etah (Uttar Pradesh) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2000.

[F. No. 1(19)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2529.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबन्ध सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2003 तक दि. मुर्शिदाबाद डिस्ट्रिक्ट सेंट्रल को-ऑपरेटिव बैंक लि., मुर्शिदाबाद (पश्चिम बंगाल) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा. सं. 1/20/99-ए.सी.]

एस. के. ठाकुर, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2529.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulations Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to The Murshidabad District Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Murshidabad (West Bengal) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2003.

[F. No. 1(20)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2530.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबन्ध सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2003 तक बड़ौदा सेंट्रल को-ऑपरेटिव बैंक लि., बड़ौदा (गुजरात) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा. सं. 1(21)/99-ए.सी.]

एस. के. ठाकुर, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2530.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulations Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Baroda Central Cooperative Bank Ltd., Baroda (Gujarat) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2003.

[F. No. 1(21)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2531.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबन्ध सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2001 तक फिरोजाबाद जिला सहकारी बैंक लि., फिरोजाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा. सं. 1(22)/99-ए.सी.]

एस. के. ठाकुर, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2531.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulations Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Firozabad Zila Sahakari Bank Ltd., Firozabad (U.P.) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2001.

[F. No. 1(22)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2532.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबन्ध सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2001 तक जिला सहकारी बैंक लि., कानपुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा. सं. 1(23)/99-ए.सी.]

एस. के. ठाकुर, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2532.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Zila Sahakari Bank Ltd., Kanpur (U.P.) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2001.

[F. No. 1(23)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ.सं. 2533:— बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबंध सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2003 तक जलगांव जिला मध्य-घर्ती सहकारी बैंक लि., जलगांव पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा.सं. 1(24)/99-ए.सी.]

एस.के. ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2533.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Jalgaon District Central Cooperative Bank Ltd., Jalgaon from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2003.

[F. No. 1(24)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2534:— बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबंध सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2003 तक जिला सहकारी केन्द्रीय बैंक मर्यादित भींद (म.प्र.) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा.सं. 1(25)/99-ए.सी.]

एस.के. ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2534.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Zila Sahakari Kendriya Bank Maryadit, Bhind (M.P.) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2003.

[F. No. 1(25)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2535 बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबंध सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मार्च, 2003 तक धुले जिला मध्यवर्ती सहकारी बैंक लि., धुले, (महाराष्ट्र) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[फा.सं. 1(26)/99-ए.सी.]

एस.के. ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2535.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of Sub-Section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Dhule District Central Cooperative Bank Ltd., Dhule, (Maharashtra) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette upto 31st March, 2003.

[F. No. 1(26)/99-AC]

S. K. THAKUR, Under Secy.

(राजस्व विभाग)

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

(आय-कर)

का. आ. 2536:—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23-ग) के उपखण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा "श्री राजा राजेश्वरी देवस्थानम ट्रस्ट, देरलूर" को कर तिथि वर्ष 1999-2000 से 2001-02 तक के लिए निम्न-

लिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) कर-निर्धारिता इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए इसका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अतःप्रत्यय उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (2) कर निर्धारिता उपर उल्लिखित कर निर्धारण वर्षों में संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक हो अथवा तरीकों से निम्न तरीकों से उसकी निधि (ज्वेल-जवाहिरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से निम्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा;
- (3) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी, जोकि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अक्षिवाध हो, जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर-निर्धारिता के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसी कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों।

[अधिसूचना सं. 11037/फा. सं. 197/91/99—आ.
क. नि. I]

समर भद्र, अवर सचिव

(Department of Revenue).

(CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES)

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 2536.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-clause (v) of clause (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Shri Raja Rajeshwari Devasthanam Trust, Bangalore" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 1999-2000 to 2001-2002 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above other wise than in any one or more of

the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;

- (iii) this notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business,

[Notification No. 11035/F. No. 197/91/99-ITA-I]

SAMAR BHADRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

(आय-कर)

का. आ. 2537 —आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23-ग) के उपखण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "श्री पद्मनाभस्वामी ऐश्वर्य ट्रस्ट, निम्नपुरम, केरल" को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 1993-94 से 1994-95 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) कर-निर्धारिता इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए इसका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अतःप्रत्यय उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (2) कर निर्धारिता उपर उल्लिखित कर निर्धारण वर्षों में संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक हो अथवा तरीकों से निम्न तरीकों से उसकी निधि (ज्वेल, जवाहिरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से निम्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा;
- (3) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी, जोकि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अक्षिवाध हो, जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर-निर्धारिता के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसी कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों।

[अधिसूचना सं. 11037/फा. सं. 197/82/97—आ.
क. नि. I]

समर भद्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 2537.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-clause (v) of clause (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Shri Padma-nabhaswamy Temple Trust, Thiruvanthapuram, Kerala" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 1993-94 to 1994-95 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) this notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business.

[Notification No. 11037/F. No. 197/ 82/97-ITA-I]

SAMAR BHADRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

(आय-कर)

का. भा. 2538.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23-ग) के उपखण्ड (V) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "बम्बई सेल्सियन सोसाइटी, मुम्बई" को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 1999-2000 से 2001-02 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उप-खण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (i) कर-निर्धारिती इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए इसका संभयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है ;

- (ii) कर निर्धारिती ऊपर उल्लिखित कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी

2564 GW/99—4.

अर्थात् के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा तरीकों से भिन्न से उनकी निर्ध (जबर, जवाहिरात, पर्वोत्तर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वीच्छक अंशदान से अर्थात्) का निर्धारण नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे अर्थात् कर-निर्धारिती संचालित ;

- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी जांच के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी, जोकि कारोबार में प्राप्त लाभ तथा अर्थात् लाभ हो, जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार अर्थात् कर-निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की अर्थात् के लिए प्रार्थनिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हैं ।

[अधिसूचना सं. 11038/पा. सं. 197/93/99—

आ. क. नि. I]

मसं-५२, अगस्त-अधिसूचना

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 2538.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-clause (v) of clause (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies the "Bombay Salesian Society, Mumbai" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 1999-2000 to 2001-2002 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) this notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business.

[Notification No. 11038/F. No. 197/93/99-ITA-I]

SAMAR BHADRA, Under Secy.

खाद्य और उपभोक्ता मामले मंत्रालय

(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1999

कां०आ०. 2539.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस/जिन भारतीय मानकों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे स्थापित हो गए हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या, वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक संख्या अतिरिक्त भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
1	2	3	4
1.	आईएस 2062 : 1999—सामान्य संरचना कार्यों के लिए इस्पात—विशिष्ट (पांचवां पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 2062 : 1992	99-04-30
2.	आईएस 2094 (भाग 2) : 1999—बिटुमेन (तार) और हमलशम के लिए हीटर—विशिष्ट भाग 2 बिटुमेन स्प्रेयर	—	99-05-31
3.	आईएस 2742 (भाग 2) : 1999—स्वचल वाहन—ब्रेक अस्तर—रबड़युक्त भाग 2 विशिष्ट	—	99-04-30
4.	आईएस 3028 : 1998—स्वचल वाहन—गतिमान वाहनों से उत्पन्न शोर—मापन पद्धति (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 3028 : 1980	98-12-31
5.	आईएस 3660 (भाग 1) : 1999—प्राकृतिक रबड़ की परीक्षण विधियां भाग 1 मूल ज्ञात करना (एन आर : 1) (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 3660 (भाग 1) : 1985	99-06-30
6.	आईएस 3660 (भाग 8) : 1999 प्राकृतिक रबड़ की परीक्षण विधियां भाग 8 मानक मिश्रण में रबड़ मिलाना तथा बल्कनीकरण (एन आर : 9) (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)		99-07-31
7.	आईएस 4236 : 1999—सौंदर्य प्रसाधन उद्योग के लिए ग्लिसराईल मोनोस्टिरियेट—विशिष्ट (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 4236 : 1985	99-05-31
8.	आईएस 5182 (भाग 4) : 1999—वायु प्रदूषण मापन पद्धतियां भाग 4 निलंबित सामग्री (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5182 (भाग 4) : 1973	99-05-31
9.	आईएस 5352 (भाग 2) : 1999—वस्त्रादि—शीशा और शीशा—पॉलिएस्टर फाइबर बोवन टेप भाग 2 परीक्षण विधियां (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)		99-06-30

1	2	3	4
10.	आईएस 5477 (भाग 1) : 1999—जलाशयों की धारिता निश्चित करने की पद्धति भाग 1 सामान्य अपेक्षाएं (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5477 (भाग 1) : 1969	99-06-30
11.	आईएस 5623 : 1999—कांच रैखिक तापीय विस्तार गुणांक ज्ञात करने की पद्धति (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5623 : 1970	99-06-30
12.	5643 : 1999—तम्बाकू और तम्बाकू उत्पाद—तम्बाकू की परीक्षण पद्धतियां (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5643 : 1989	99-04-30
13.	आईएस 5887 (भाग 4) : 1999—खाद्य विषाक्तता उत्पन्न करने वाले जीवाणुओं के संसूचन की पद्धतियां भाग 4 फ्लोसट्रीडियम परफिर्जेस और क्लौसट्रीडियम बोटुलिनम का विलगन	आईएस 5887 (भाग 4) : 1976	99-06-30
14.	आईएस 5887 (भाग 7) : 1999—खाद्य विषाक्तता उत्पन्न करने वाले जीवाणुओं की संसूचन पद्धतियां भाग 7 शिंगेला का विलगन करने और पहचान के लिए पद्धतियों के सामान्य मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत	—	99-06-30
15.	आईएस 5934 : 1999—रोलिंग बेयरिंग शीम्फर आयाम—अधिकतम मान—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5934 : 1987	99-06-30
16.	आईएस 5984 : 1999—लघु लैम्पों के ग्लास खोल—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5984 : 1971	99-05-31
17.	आईएस 6849 (भाग 1) : 1999—घनात्मक विस्थापन निर्यात पंप—कार्यकारिता लक्षणों का मापन भाग 1 प्रवाह (पंपिंग गति) की आयतन दर का मापन (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 6849 (भाग 1) : 1993	99-06-30
18.	आईएस 7008 (भाग 4) : 1999—आई०एस०ओ० मीट्रिक समलम्बी पेंच बूड़ियां भाग 4 छूटें (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 7008 (भाग 4) : 1988	99-05-31
19.	आईएस 7308 : 1999—गैर-शंकुधारी लट्टे—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 7308 : 1974	99-06-30
20.	आईएस 7900 : 1999—आंकड़ा घटक और अंतर्विनियम फोर्मेट—सूचना का अंतर्विनियम—तिथि और समय देना (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 7900 : 1976	99-05-31
21.	आईएस 8243 (भाग 1) : 1999—वाष्प निर्यात पंप—कार्यकारिता लक्षणों का मापन भाग 1 प्रवाह (पंपिंग गति) की आयतन दर मापन (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 8243 (भाग 1) : 1993	99-06-30
22.	आईएस 10704 : 1999—मिट्टी उठाने की मशीनरी—अभिगम प्रणालियां (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 10704 : 1991	99-07-31

1	2	3	4
23.	आईएस 11113 : 1999—कृषि और बालिका के लिए मिट्टी उठाने की मशीनरी और ट्रैक्टर और मशीनरी मीट सूचकांक बिंदु (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 11113 : 1993	99-06-30
24.	आईएस 11904 : 1999 रोलिंग बैयरिंग अवस्थापित स्मैप रिंग वाले त्रिज्य बैयरिंग—आयाम एवं छुट्टे—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 11904 : 1997	99-07-31
25.	आईएस 12879 (भाग 2) : 1999—तकनीकी ड्राइंग और अन्य ड्राइंग कार्यालयी प्रलेखों की माइक्रोफिल्म बनाना भाग 2—35 मि.मी. की सिल्वर जिलेटिन माइक्रोफिल्म के गुणता सम्बन्धी मानदंड और विवर्जन (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 12879 (भाग 2) : 1990	99-06-30
26.	आईएस 12879 (भाग 4) : 1999—तकनीकी ड्राइंग और अन्य ड्राइंग कार्यालयी प्रलेखों की माइक्रोफिल्म बनाना भाग 4 विशेष और असाधारण दीर्घकृत माइज की ड्राइंग की माइक्रोफिल्म बनाना	—	99-06-30
27.	आईएस 13360 (भाग 3/खंड 9) : 1999—प्लास्टिक— परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 3 भौतिक तथा आयामीय गुणधर्म खंड 9 फास्फोरस पेन्टाआक्साईड के क्लोमेट्रिक पुनरुत्पादन द्वारा प्लास्टिक में नमी ज्ञात करना	—	99-06-30
28.	आईएस 13360 (भाग 9/खंड 5) : 1999—प्लास्टिक— परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 9 प्रकाशिक गुणधर्म खंड 5 पारदर्शी प्लास्टिक की छुट्टे और दोषों का परीक्षण करना	—	99-07-31
29.	आईएस 13360 (भाग 11/खंड 4) : 1999—प्लास्टिक— परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 11 विशिष्ट गुणधर्म खंड 4 प्लास्टिक पटल की जेल गणना ज्ञात करना	—	99-07-31
30.	आईएस 13360 (भाग 11/खंड 11) : 1999—प्लास्टिक— परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 11 विशिष्ट गुणधर्म खंड 11 द्रव अवस्था अवस्था पायस रूप अवस्था परीक्षण में बहुलक/रेजिन मिश्रित अपरूपण दर सहित घूर्णन विस्कासिता मापी का उपयोग करते हुए विस्कामिता ज्ञात करना	—	99-04-30
31.	आईएस 13405 : 1999—रोलिंग बैयरिंग बेलमाकार रोलर बैयरिंग, विलगक्षेप कॉनर परिधि आयाम—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 13405 : 1992	99-07-31
32.	आईएस 13557 (भाग 18) : 1999—सूचना प्रक्रमण तंत्र— शब्दावली भाग 18 स्वतंत्र आंकड़ा प्रक्रमण	—	99-06-30
33.	आईएस 13730 (भाग 45) : 1999—विशेष प्रकार के कुल्लहन तारों के लिए विशिष्टियां भाग 45 पॉलिएस्टर इमैमल गोल तांबे के तार, वर्ग 130	—	99-07-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
34.	आईएस 13862 : 1999—चाय—जल निष्कर्ष ज्ञात करना (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 13862 : 1994	99-06-30
35.	आईएस/आईएसओ 14041 : 1998—पर्यावरण प्रबंध—जीवन — चक्र मूल्यांकन—लक्ष्य एवं विषय क्षेत्र की परिभाषा तथा सामग्री-सूची विश्लेषण		99-06-30
36.	आईएस 14203 : 1999—अग्नि प्रतिरोधी अभिलेख संरक्षण केबिनेट—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 14203 : 1994	99-07-31
37.	आईएस- 14231 (भाग 7) : 1999—दूरदर्शन और ध्वनि — संकेतों के लिये केवलकृत वितरण प्रणाली भाग 7 प्रणाली के लिए विद्युत-बुल्वकीय अनुरूपता		99-05-31
38.	आईएस 14563 (भाग 2) : 1999—बस्त्रादि फार्मलबीहाइड्र — की अवधारणा भाग 2 रिलीज फार्मलबीहाइड्र		99-06-30
39.	आईएस 14591 : 1999—बांधों में बहुमूल्य कंक्रीट का ताम्र — नियंत्रण मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत		99-05-31
40.	आईएस 14599 : 1999—स्वचल वाहन घनात्मक एवं संपीड़न — प्रज्वलन इंजनों की कार्यकारिता अपेक्षाएं (पावर एस एफ सी धुंध्रा)—परीक्षण पद्धति		99-06-30
41.	आईएस 14633 : 1999—कक्षाओं में लघु परियोजनाएं—विशिष्ट —		99-05-31
42.	आईएस 14641 : 1999—टर्बोसंपीड़क—निष्पादन परीक्षण — संहिता		99-02-28
43.	आईएस 14658 : 1999—उच्च वोल्टता प्रत्यावर्ती करंट के — परिपथ ब्रेकर —घातु परिपथ एवं डैड टैंक परिपथ ब्रेकरों के लिए लघु परिपथ और स्विचिंग परीक्षण प्रक्रियाओं की मार्ग- दर्शिका		99-06-30
44.	आईएस 14666 : 1999—उच्च वोल्टता प्रत्यावर्ती करंट — स्विच-स्पूज संयोजन		99-06-30
45.	आईएस 14680 : 1999 भूस्खलन नियंत्रण मार्गदर्शिका —		99-06-30
46.	आईएस 14681 : 1999—स्वचल वाहन—दुपहिया या तिप- — हिया वाहनों की ईंधन टंकियां		99-06-30
47.	आईएस 14683 : 1999—कृषि ट्रैक्टर एवं मशीनरी—सार्व- — जनिक मार्गों पर यात्रा के लिए प्रकाशीय युक्तियां		99-06-30
48.	आईएस 14686 (भाग 1) : 1999—रेडियो बारम्बारता — और समाक्ष केबल समुच्चय भाग 1 सामान्य विशिष्ट —सामान्य अपेक्षाएं और परीक्षण पद्धतियां		99-06-30
49.	आई एस 14692 (भाग 1) : 1999—सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी — —शब्दावली भाग 1 आधारभूत निबन्धन		99-06-30
50.	आई एस 14695 : 1999—कांच रेशा आधारित कोलतार — पिच बाहरी आवरण—विशिष्ट		99-06-30

1	2	3	4
51.	आई एस 14716: 1999—भूवस्त्रादि—प्रति इकाई क्षेत्र में संहति ज्ञात करना	—	99-06-30
52.	आई एस 14718: 1999—तप्त इष्टिकाकृत लोहा (एच० बी० आई०) का संघट्ट सूचकांक—निर्धारण	—	99-06-30

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110 002 क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों नई दिल्ली, कलकत्ता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई और शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, फरीदाबाद, गाजियाबाद, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, लखनऊ, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं० के प्र वि/13: 2]
जे० वेंकटरमन, अपर महानिदेशक

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

(Department of Consumer Affairs)

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1999

S.O. 2539.—In pursuance of clause(b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established on the date indicated against each:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No. year and Title of the Indian Standards No. Established	No. & year of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Date of Establishment
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. IS 2062:1999—Steel for general structural purposes—Specification (Fifth Revision)	IS 2062:1992	99-04-30
2. IS 2094(Part 2):1999—Specification for heater for bitumen (Tar) and emulsion Part 2 Bitumen sprayer	—	99-05-31
3. IS 2742 (Part 2):1999—Automotive vehicles—Brake linking—rubberised Part 2 Specification	—	99-04-30
4. IS 3028:1908—Automotive vehicles—noise emitted by moving vehicles—method of measurement (Second Revision)	IS 3028:1980 IS 3660 (Pt. 1) : 85	98-12-31 99-06-30
5. IS 3660(Part 1): 1999—Methods of test for natural rubber Part 1 Determination of Dirt [NR:1] (Third Revision)	—	—
6. IS 3650(Part 8):1999—Methods of test for natural rubber Part 8 Mixing and vulcanizing of rubber in standard compound [NR:9] (Second Revision)	—	99-07-31
7. IS 4236:1999—Glyceryl monostearate for cosmetic industry—specification (Third Revision)	IS 4236:1985	99-05-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8.	IS 5182(Part 4):1999—Method for measurement of air pollution Part 4 Suspended particulate matter (First Revision)	IS 5182(Pt. 4):1973	99-05-31
9.	IS 5352(Part 2):1999—Textiles—glass and glass-polyester fibre woven tapes Part 2 Methods of test (Third Revision)		99-06-30
10.	IS 5477(Part 1):1999—Fixing the capacities of reservoirs methods Part 1 General requirements (First Revision)	IS 5477(Pt. 1):69	99-06-30
11.	IS 5623:1999—Method of determination of coefficient of linear thermal expansion of glass (First Revision)	IS 5623-1970	99-06-30
12.	IS 5643:1999—Tobacco and tobacco products—methods of test for tobacco (Second Revision)	IS 5643:1989	99-04-30
13.	IS 5887(Part 4):1999—Methods for detection of bacteria responsible for food poisoning Part 4 Isolation and identification of clostridium perfringens (Clostridium welchii) and clostridium botulinum and enumeration of clostridium perfringens (Second Revision)	IS 5887(Pt. 4):76	99-06-30
14.	IS 5887(Part 7):1999—Methods for detection of bacteria responsible for food poisoning Part 7 General guidance on methods for isolation and identification of shigella		99-06-30
15.	IS 5934:1999—Rolling bearings—character dimensions—maximum values-Specification (Second Revision)	IS 5934:1987	99-06-30
16.	IS 5984:1999—Glass shells for miniature lamps—Specification (First Revision)	IS 5984-1971	99-05-31
17.	IS 6849(Part 1):1999—Positive displacement vacuum pumps-measurement of performance characteristics Part 1 Measurement of volume rate of flow (pumping speed) (Second Revision)	IS 6849(Pt. 1):93	99-06-30
18.	IS 7008(Part 4):1999—ISO Metric trapezoidal screw threads Part 4 Tolerances (Second Revision)	IS 7008(Pt. 4):88	99-05-31
19.	IS 7308:1999—Non-coniferous logs—Specification (First Revision)	IS 7308:1974	99-06-30
20.	IS 7900:1999—Data elements and interchange formats—information interchange—representation of dates and times (First Revision)	IS 7900:1976	99-05-31
21.	IS 8243 (Part 1):1999—Vapour vacuum pumps—measurement of performance characteristics Part 1 measurement of volume rate of flow (pumping speed) (Second Revision)	IS 8243 (Pt. 1):93	99-06-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
22.	IS 10704:1999—Earth-moving machinery—access systems (Second Revision)	IS 10704:1991	99-07-31
23.	IS 11113:1999—Earth-moving machinery, and tractors and machinery for agriculture and forestry—seat index point (Second Revision)	IS 11113:1993	99-06-30
24.	IS 11904:1999—Rolling bearings—radial bearings with locating SNAP ring—dimensions and tolerances— —specification (First Revision)	IS 11904:1997	99-07-31
25.	IS 12879 (Part 2):1999—Microfilming of technical drawings and other drawing office documents Part 2. Quality criteria and control of 35-mm SILVER GELATIN MICROFILMS (First Revision)	IS 12879 (Pt. 2):90	99-06-30
26.	IS 12879 (Part 4):1999—Microfilming of technical drawings and other drawing office documents Part 4 Microfilming of drawings of special and exceptional elongated sizes	—	99-06-30
27.	IS 13360 (Part 3/Sec 9):1999—Plastics—Methods of testing Part 3 Physical and dimensional properties Section 9 Determination of moisture in plastics by coulometric regeneration of phosphorus pentoxide	—	99-06-30
28.	IS 13360 (Part 9/Sec. 5):1999—Plastics—Methods of testing Part 9 Optical properties Section 5 determination of haze and luminous transmittance of transparent plastics	—	99-07-31
29.	IS 13360 (Part 11/Sec 4):1999—Plastics Methods of testing Part 11 Special properties Section 4 Determination of gel count of plastics film	—	99-07-31
30.	IS 13360 (Part 11/Sec 11):1999—Plastics—Methods of testing Part 11 Special properties Section 11 polymers/resins in the liquid state or as emulsions or dispersions—determination of viscosity using a rotational viscometer with defined shear rate	—	99-04-30
31.	IS 13405:1999—Rolling bearings—cylindrical roller bearings, separate thrust collars—boundary dimensions—specification (First Revision)	IS 13405:1992	99-07-31
32.	IS 13557 (Part 18):1999—Information processing systems—vocabulary Part 18 Distributed data processing	—	99-06-30
33.	IS 13730 (Part 45):1999—Specifications for particular types of winding wires Part 45 Polyester enamelled round copper wire, class 130	—	99-07-31
34.	IS 13862:1999—Tea—Determination of water extract (First Revision)	IS 13862:1994	99-06-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
35.	IS/ISO 14041:1998—Environmental management—life cycle assessment—goal and scope definition and inventory analysis	—	99-06-30
36.	IS 14203:1999—Fire resisting record protecting cabinets—specification (First Revision)	IS 14203:1994	99-07-31
37.	IS 14231 (Part 7):1999—Cabled distribution systems for television and sound signal Part 7 Electromagnetic compatibility of systems	—	99-05-31
38.	IS 14563 (Part 2):1999—Textiles—Determination of formaldehyde Part 2 Released formaldehyde	—	99-06-30
39.	IS 14591:1999—Temperature control of mass concrete for dams—guidelines	—	99-05-31
40.	IS 14599:1999—Automotive vehicles—performance requirements (measurement of power, SFC, opacity) of positive and compression ignition engines—method of test	—	99-06-30
41.	IS 14633:1999—Blackboards for class rooms—Specification	—	99-05-31
42.	IS 14641:1999—Turbocompressor—performance test code	—	99-02-28
43.	IS 14658:1999—High voltage alternating current circuit breakers—guide for short-circuit and switching test procedures for metal-enclosed and dead tank circuit breakers	—	99-06-30
44.	IS 14666:1999—High-voltage alternating current switch-fuse combinations	—	99-06-30
45.	IS 14680:1999—Landslide control—guidelines	—	99-06-30
46.	IS 14681:1999—Automotive vehicles-fuel tanks for two or three wheelers	—	99-06-30
47.	IS 14683:1999—Agricultural tractors and machinery—lighting devices for travel on public roads	—	99-06-30
48.	IS 14686 (Part 1):1999—Radio frequency and coaxial cable assemblies Part 1 Generic specification—general requirements and test methods	—	99-06-30
49.	IS 14692 (Part 1):1999—information technology—vocabulary Part 1 Fundamental terms	—	99-06-30
50.	IS 14695:1999—Glass fibre base coal tar pitch outer-wrap—specification	—	99-06-30
51.	IS 14716:1999—Geotextiles—determination of mass per unit area	—	99-06-30
52.	IS 14718:1999—Impact index for hot briquetted iron (HBI)—determination	—	99-06-30

Copy of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zaffar Marg, New Delhi-110 002 and Regional Offices: New Delhi, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices: Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Goimbatore, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD/13:2]

J. VENKATARAMAN, Addl. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1999

क्र०आ० 2540.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे विद्ये गए मानक(कों) में संशोधन किया गया है/किये गये हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	संशोधित भारतीय मानक की संख्या और वर्ष	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तारीख
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस 616 : 1986	संशोधन सं० 2 जून 1999	99-06-30
2.	आई एस 758 : 1988	संशोधन सं० 1 जुलाई 1999	99-07-31
3.	आईएस 779 : 1994	संशोधन सं० 3 अगस्त 1999	99-08-31
4.	आईएस 804 : 1967	संशोधन सं० 2 अगस्त 1999	99-08-31
5.	आईएस 863 : 1988	संशोधन सं० 3 जुलाई 1999	99-07-31
6.	आईएस 1011 : 1992	संशोधन सं० 4 जून 1999	99-06-30
7.	आईएस 3416 : 1988	संशोधन सं० 2 मई 1999	99-05-31
8.	आईएस 4398 : 1994	संशोधन सं० 1 जुलाई 1999	99-07-31
9.	आईएस 4684 : 1975	संशोधन सं० 2 जुलाई 1999	99-07-31
10.	आईएस 4956 : 1977	संशोधन सं० 6 अगस्त 1999	99-08-31
11.	आईएस 4985 : 1988	संशोधन सं० 4 अगस्त 1999	99-08-31
12.	आईएस 5517 : 1993	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999	99-08-31
13.	आईएस 6158 : 1984	संशोधन सं० 1 जून 1999	99-06-30
14.	आईएस 6529 : 1996	संशोधन सं० 1 जून 1999	99-06-30
15.	आईएस 9601 : 1988	संशोधन सं० 2 अप्रैल 1999	99-04-30
16.	आईएस 7005 : 1973	संशोधन सं० 2 जुलाई 1999	99-07-31
17.	आईएस 8180 : 1992	संशोधन सं० 2 अगस्त 1999	99-08-31

1	2	3	4
18. आईएस 8664 : 1977	संशोधन सं० 2 जुलाई 1999		99-07-31
19. आईएस 9458 : 1994	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
20. आईएस 11006 : 1984	संशोधन सं० 2 जनवरी 1999		99-01-31
21. आईएस 12151 : 1987	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
22. आईएस 12235 (भाग 1-ii) : 86	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
23. आईएस 13592 : 1992	संशोधन सं० 2 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
24. आईएस 13667 : 1993	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
25. आईएस 13826 (भाग 1) : 1993	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
26. आईएस 13826 (भाग 2) : 1993	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
27. आईएस 13826 (भाग 7) : 1993	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
28. आईएस 13873 : 1993	संशोधन सं० 1 अगस्त 1999		99-08-31
29. आईएस 14466 : 1997	संशोधन सं० 1 जुलाई 1999		99-07-31

इन संशोधनों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110 002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों नई दिल्ली, कलकत्ता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, भुवई और शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयंबटूर, फरीदाबाद, गाजियाबाद, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, लखनऊ, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में वित्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं० के प्र वि / 13 : 5]
जे० वेंटकरमन, अपर महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1999

S.O.2540.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendments to the Indian Standards, given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been issued:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Year of the Indian Standard amended	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the Amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 616:1986	Amendment No. 2 June 1999	99-06-30
2.	IS 758:1988	Amendment No. 1 July 1999	99-07-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3. IS 779:1994	Amendment No. 3 August 1999		99-08-31
4. IS 804:1967	Amendment No. 2 August 1999		99-08-31
5. IS 863:1988	Amendment No. 3 July 1999		99-07-31
6. IS 1011:1992	Amendment No. 4 June 1999		99-06-30
7. IS 3416:1988	Amendment No. 2 May 1999		99-05-31
8. IS 4398:1994	Amendment No. 1 July 1999		99-07-31
9. IS 4684:1975	Amendment No. 2 July 1999		99-07-31
10. IS 4956:1977	Amendment No. 6 August 1999		99-08-31
11. IS 4985:1988	Amendment No. 4 August 1999		99-08-31
12. IS 5517:1993	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
13. IS 6158:1984	Amendment No. 1 June 1999		99-06-30
14. IS 6529:1996	Amendment No. 1 June 1999		99-06-30
15. IS 6901:1988	Amendment No. 2 April 1999		99-04-30
16. IS 7005:1973	Amendment No. 2 July 1999		99-07-31
17. IS 8180:1992	Amendment No. 2 August 1999		99-08-31
18. IS 8664:1977	Amendment No. 2 July 1999		99-07-31
19. IS 9458:1994	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
20. IS 11006:1984	Amendment No. 2 January 1999		99-01-31
21. IS 12151:1987	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
22. IS 12235 (Pts. to 11):86	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
23. IS 13592:1992	Amendment No. 2 August 1999		99-08-31
24. IS 13667:1993	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
25. IS 13826 (Part 1):1993	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31

1	2	3	4
26. IS 13826 (Part 2):1993	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
27. IS 13826 (Part 7):1993	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
28. IS 13873:1893	Amendment No. 1 August 1999		99-08-31
29. IS 14466:1997	Amendment No. 1 July 1999		99-07-31

Copy of these amendments are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110 002 and Regional Offices: New Delhi, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices: Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD/13:5]

J. VENKATARAMAN, Addl. Director General

कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2541.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कोयले प्रतिष्ठित होता है कि इसमें उपावद्ध अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अभिप्राप्त किये जाने की संभावना है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस क्षेत्र में कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले रेखांक सं. एस ई सी एल/बी एस पी/जी एम (पीएलजी)/भूमि 226, तारीख 29 मार्च, 1999 का निरीक्षण साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग), सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर-495006 (मध्य प्रदेश) कार्यालय में या कलकटर, उमरिया (मध्य प्रदेश) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाली भूमि में, हितवद्ध सभी व्यक्ति उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में निर्दिष्ट सभी नक्शों, चार्टों और अन्य दस्तावेजों को इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से नब्बे दिन के भीतर विभाग (राजस्व), साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि., सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर-495006 (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रधान/भारसाधक अधिकारी को भेजेंगे।

अनुसूची

पाली खंड

जहिल्ला क्षेत्र

जिला-उमरिया (मध्य प्रदेश)

रेखांक सं. एसईसीएल/बीएसपी/जीएम/(पीएलजी)/भूमि/226, तारीख 29 मई, 1999 (पूर्वेक्षण के लिये अधिसूचित भूमि देखें)

क. राजस्व भूमि

क्रम सं.	ग्राम	साधारण संख्यांक	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र, हेक्टर में	विष्पणियां
1.	पाली	408	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	275.433	भाग
2.	मलहदू	606	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	158.601	सम्पूर्ण

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	मुदरिया	624	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	047.552	भाग
4.	उचेहरा	040	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	073.120	भाग
5.	कुरावर	114	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	055.532	भाग
6.	कुमर्द	123	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	152.298	भाग
7.	खलौध	146	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	062.816	भाग
8.	गोरइया	188	बान्धवगढ़	उमरिया	073.274	भाग
कुल					898.626	

ख. आरंभित वन

क्रम सं.	कम्पार्टमेंट सं.	रेंज	प्रभाग	क्षेत्र	टिप्पणियां
1.	539, 540 और 541	पाली	शहडोल	260.026	भाग
कुल योग : 1158.652 हेक्टर (लगभग)					या 2863.03 एकड़ (लगभग)

सीमा वर्णन

क-ख-ग	रेखा, पाली ग्राम में बिन्दु "क" से आरंभ होती है और पाली ग्रामों में होकर गुजरती है, तत्पश्चात्, भागतः खलौध-सुखा ग्राम की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और बिन्दु "ग" पर मिलती है।
ग-घ	रेखा, खलौध, उचेहरा, कुरावर ग्रामों में होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु "घ" पर मिलती है।
घ-ङ	रेखा, कुरावर, मुदरिया ग्रामों में होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु "ङ" पर मिलती है।
ङ-च-छ	रेखा, मुदरिया, कुमर्द, पाली, गोरइया ग्रामों में होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु "छ" पर मिलती है।
छ-ज-झ	रेखा, भागतः गंजरा नाला से होकर गुजरती है और तत्पश्चात् ग्राम गोरइया से, फिर गंजरा नाला से, इसके बाद ग्राम पाली से होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु "झ" पर मिलती है।
झ-ञ-ट-ड-क	रेखा, ग्राम पाली में होकर गुजरती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है।

[फा.सं. 43015/5/99-पी.आर.आई डब्ल्यू]
प्रेमानन्द दास, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COAL

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O.2541.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands mentioned in the Schedule hereto annexed;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of the 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein;

The plan bearing No. SECL/BSP/GM(PLG)/land/226, dated the 29th May, 1999 of the area covered by this notification can be inspected in the Office of the Collector, Umari (Madhya Pradesh) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, I, Council House Street, Calcutta-700001 or in the Office of the South Eastern Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Seepat Road, Bilaspur-495006 (Madhya Pradesh).

All persons interested in the land covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Officer-in-charge/Head of the Department (Revenue), South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Bilaspur-495006 (Madhya Pradesh) within ninety days from the date of the publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

**SCHEDULE
PALI BLOCK
JOHILLA AREA**

DISTRICT-UMARIA (MADHYA PRADESH)

Plan No. SECL/BSP/GM(PLG)/LAND/226 dated the 29th May, 1999 (showing the land notified for prospecting)

A. REVENUE LAND

Sl. No.	Village	General number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Pali	408	Bandhogarh	Umaria	275.433	Part
3.	Malahdoo	606	Bandhogarh	Umaria	158.601	Full
3.	Mudaria	624	Bandhogarh	Umaria	047.552	Part
4.	Uchchra	040	Bandhogarh	Umaria	073.120	Part
5.	Kurawar	114	Bandhogarh	Umaria	055.532	Part
6.	Kumardoo	123	Bandhogarh	Umaria	152.298	Part
7.	Khalundh	146	Bandhogarh	Umaria	062.816	Part
8.	Goraia	188	Bandhogarh	Umaria	073.274	Part
Total					898.626	

B. RESERVED FOREST

Sl. No.	Compartment Number	Range	Division	Area	Remarks
1.	539,540 and 541	Pali	Shahdol	260.026	Part
Grand total —1158.652 hectares (approximately) or 2863.03 acres (approximately)					

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

- A—B—C —Line starts from point "A" in village Pali and passes through village Pali, then partly along the common boundary of villages Khalaundh-Sukha and meets at point "C".
- C—D —Line passes through villages Khalaundh, Uchchra, Kurawar and meets at Point "D".
- D—E —Line passes through villages Kurawar, Mudaria and meets at Point "E".
- F—F—G —Line passes through villages Mudaria, Kumardoo, Pali, Goraia and meets at Point "G".
- G—H—I —Line passes partly through Ganjra Nullah, then through Garaia village, again through Ganjra Nullah, through Pali village and meets at Point "I".
- I—J—K—L—M—A—Line passes through Pali Village and meets at the starting point "A".

[No. 43015/5/99-PRIW]

PREMANAND DAS, Director

नई दिल्ली, 2 सितम्बर, 1999

का. आ. 2542.--केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1948 के पैरा 4 के साथ पठित कोयला खान भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 46) की धारा 3क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 1 अक्टूबर, 1994 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 2525, तारीख 1 सितम्बर, 1994 को उन बातों के सिवाय अधि-क्रांत करते हुए, जिन्हें ऐसे अधिक्रमण से पहले किया गया है या करने का लोप किया गया है, निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से पांच वर्ष की अवधि के लिए ही न्यासी बोर्ड का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात् :—

1. सचिव, भारत सरकार अध्यक्ष
कोयला मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली
पिन—110 001
2. कोयला खान भविष्य निधि, आयुक्त सदस्य, पदेन
कोयला खान भविष्य निधि संगठन,
धनबाद (बिहार)
पिन—826 001
धारा 3क की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) के अधीन नियुक्त
3. संयुक्त सचिव, भारत सरकार सदस्य
(जो कोयला खान भविष्य निधि का कार्य देख रहा हो)
कोयला मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली ।
पिन—110 001
4. संयुक्त सचिव-मह-वित्तीय सलाहकार , सदस्य
कोयला मंत्रालय
नई-दिल्ली
पिन 110 001
5. केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त सदस्य
कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन]
हुडको विशाला,
14 भीकाजी कामा प्लेस,
नई दिल्ली
पिन—110 066
धारा 3 क की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नियुक्त
6. श्रम आयुक्त सदस्य
बिहार सरकार, पटना, बिहार
पिन-800 015
7. संयुक्त सचिव, सदस्य
श्रम विभाग,
पश्चिमी बंगाल सरकार
कलकत्ता, पश्चिमी बंगाल,
पिन—700 001
8. श्रम आयुक्त, सदस्य
मध्य प्रदेश सरकार,
न्यू मोती बंगलो, महात्मा गांधी रोड,
इन्दौर, मध्य प्रदेश
पिन-452 001
9. श्रम आयुक्त, सदस्य
आन्ध्र प्रदेश सरकार,
हेदराबाद, आन्ध्र प्रदेश,
पिन—500 001

10. श्रम आयुक्त,
महाराष्ट्र सरकार,
मुंबई, महाराष्ट्र
पिन-400 034
11. सचिव,
श्रम और रोजगार विभाग,
उड़ीसा सरकार,
भुवनेश्वर, उड़ीसा
पिन-751001
धारा 3 क की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (इ) के अधीन नियुक्त
12. निदेशक (कार्मिक और औद्योगिक संबंध)
कोल इण्डिया लिमिटेड,
10, नेताजी सुभाष रोड,
कलकत्ता, पश्चिमी बंगाल,
पिन-700 001
13. निदेशक (कार्मिक)
सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कंपनी लिमिटेड,
कोटागुडम, जिला खम्माम,
आन्ध्र प्रदेश--507 101
14. निदेशक (कार्मिक)
भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड,
कोयला भवम, कोयला नगर,
धनबाद, बिहार
पिन-826001
15. श्री सी. आर. दाम,
मेवानिवन सी. एम. डी.
एम. सी. एल.
सी-91, पालम पाली,
भुवनेश्वर, उड़ीसा,
पिन-751 009
16. निदेशक (कार्मिक)
सेंट्रल कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड
दरभंगा हाउस, रांची
बिहार
पिन-834001
17. निदेशक (कार्मिक)
ईस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड
सेक्टरिया, डाकघर, विशेषगढ़
जिला बर्दवान, पश्चिमी बंगाल,
पिन-713 333
धारा 3क की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन नियुक्त
18. श्री एस. के. राय
महामार्गध्वज,
राष्ट्रीय कोलियरी मजदूर संघ,
राजेन्द्र पथ, धनबाद (बिहार)
पिन-826 001

19. श्री प्रार. के. शिब
राष्ट्रीय कोयला खदान मजदूर संघ
प्लॉट संख्या 604
प्रादेशिक परिवहन कार्यालय
गिरीपेथ, नागपुर
महाराष्ट्र
पिन-440 001 सदस्य
20. श्री मोहन शा,
सचिव,
संयुक्त खदान मजदूर संघ
कोल एस्टेट, नौवां नल
सिविल लाइन्स,
नागपुर, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन-440 001 सदस्य
21. श्री राजेन्द्र कुमार राय
भारतीय कोयला खदान मजदूर संघ, कार्यालय
विश्वकर्मा भवन, परासिया मेन रोड,
झाकघर—परासिया,
छिबवाड़ा, मध्य प्रदेश—480 441 सदस्य
22. श्री जयन्त पोद्दे,
उपाध्यक्ष,
हिंद मजदूर सभा, बंगाल होटल,
2. मोहम्मद हुसैन स्ट्रीट,
झाकघर, आसनत्तोल
जिला बर्बवान, पश्चिमी बंगाल
पिन-713301 सदस्य
23. श्री दिपांकर बासु,
मुख्य वित्तीय प्रबंधक
कोल इंडिया लिमिटेड,
10, नेताजी सुभाष रोड,
कलकत्ता-700 001 सदस्य

[फा. सं. 20/36/98-ए.स.प्रो]
पी. के. जी. नायर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 2nd September, 1999

S.O. 2542.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1948 (46 of 1948), read with paragraph 4 of the Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme, 1948, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal, number S.O. 2525, dated the 1st September, 1994 published at pages 3742 to 3743 in part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 1st October, 1994 except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government hereby appoints the following persons to the Board of Trustees for a period of five years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, namely :—

1. Secretary
to the Government of India,
Ministry of Coal,
New Delh,
Pin 110001

—Chairman

2. Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner,
Coal Mines Provident Fund Organisation,
Dhanbad (Bihar),
Pin 826 001 —Member ex-officio

Appointed under clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 3A

3. Joint Secretary to the Government of India
(Incharge Coal Mines
Provident Fund Affairs),
Ministry of Coal,
New Delhi
Pin 110001 —Member
4. Joint Secretary-cum-Financial Adviser,
Ministry of Coal,
New Delhi
Pin 110001. —Member
5. Central Provident Fund
Commissioner,
Employees' Provident Fund Organisation
Hudco Vishala, 14 Bhikaiji Cama Place,
New Delhi
Pin 110066 —Member

Appointed under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 3A

6. Commissioner of Labour,
Government of Bihar,
Patna, Bihar,
Pin-800 015 —Member
7. Joint Secretary,
Labour Department,
Government of West Bengal,
Calcutta, West Bengal,
Pin-700 001 —Member
8. Commissioner of Labour,
Government of Madhya Pradesh,
New Moti Bangalow,
Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Indore, Madhya Pradesh,
Pin 452 001 —Member
9. Commissioner of Labour,
Government of Andhra Pradesh,
Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh,
Pin 500 001 —Member
10. Commissioner of Labour,
Government of Maharashtra,
Mumbai, Maharashtra,
Pin 400 034 —Member
11. Secretary,
Labour and Employment Department,
Government of Orissa,
Bhubaneshwar, Orissa,
Pin 751 001 —Member

Appointed under clause (e) of sub-section (1) of Section 3A

12. Director (Personnel and Industrial Relations),
Coal India Limited,
10, Netaji Subhash Road,
Calcutta, West Bengal,
Pin 700 001 —Member

-
- | | |
|---|---------|
| 13. Director (Personnel),
Singareni Collieries
Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Kothagudem, Khammam District,
Andhra Pradesh,
Pin 507101 | —Member |
| 14. Director (Personnel),
Bharat Coking Coal Limited
Koyla Bhawan, Koyla Nagar,
Dhanbad, Bihar,
Pin 826 001 | —Member |
| 15. Shri C.R. Das, Retired CMD, MCL.
C-91 Palas Palli,
Bhubaneswar, Orissa,
Pin-751 009 | —Member |
| 16. Director (Personnel),
Central Coalfields Limited,
Darbhanga House,
Ranchi, Bihar,
Pin 834 001 | —Member |
| 17. Director (Personnel),
Eastern Coalfields Limited,
Sanctoria, P.O. Disergarh,
District-Burdwan, West Bengal,
Pin 713 333 | —Member |
| Appointed under clause (f) of sub-section (1) of section 3A | |
| 18. Shri S. K. Rai,
General Secretary,
Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh,
Rajendra Path,
Dhanbad, Bihar,
Pin 826 001 | —Member |
| 19. Shri R. K. Chib,
Rashtriya Koyla Khadan Mazdoor Sangh,
Plot No. 604,
Opp. Regional Transport Office,
Giripeth, Nagpur,
Maharashtra,
Pin 440 010 | —Member |
| 20. Shri Mohan Jha,
Secretary,
Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh,
Coal Estate, 9th Floor,
Civil Lines,
Nagpur, Maharashtra,
Pin 440 001 | —Member |
| 21. Shri Brajendra Kumar Roy,
Bharatiya Koyla Khadan Mazdoor Sangh,
Vishwakarma Bhawan,
Parasia—Main Road,
Post Office—Parasia,
Chhindwara, Madhya Pradesh,
Pin 480 441 | —Member |
-

22. Shri Jayanta Podder,

—Member

Vice President,

Hind Mazdoor Sabha, Bengal Hotel,

2, Md. Hussain Street, P.O. Asansol,

District-Burdwan, West Bengal,

Pin-713 301.

23. Shri Dipankar Basu,

—Member

Chief Finance Manager,

Coal India Limited,

10, Netaji Subhas Road,

Calcutta-700001.

[F.No.20/36/98-ASO]

P. K. G. NAIR, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य एवं परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2543.—केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् से परामर्श के पश्चात्, उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में,—

(1) 'अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने 'मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता' के स्तम्भ में (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् 'स्तम्भ (2)' कहा गया है), 'मास्टर आफ सर्जरी (आटो-राइनी-लेरिगोलोजी)' प्रविष्टि और उससे संबंधित 'एजिस्ट्रेशन के लिये संशोधन' के स्तम्भ में (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् 'स्तम्भ (3)' कहा गया है), की प्रविष्टि के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात्:—

2

3

'डिप्लोमा इन अनेस्थेसियोलोजी

डी.ए.

(यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त अर्हता होगी जब यह 1973 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो);

(2) 'पंजाबी विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने, स्तम्भ (2) में, 'डिप्लोमा इन स्पोर्ट मेडिसिन' प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (3) में उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात्:—

2

3

'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन

(माइक्रोबायोलोजी)

एम. डी. (माइक्रो)

(यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह जुलाई 1981 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो);

(3) 'उत्कल विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने, स्तम्भ (2) में, 'डा. आफ मेडिसिन (टी.बी. एण्ड रेस्परेटरी डिजीजेज)' प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (3) में उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात्:—

2

3

'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन
(मनोविकार चिकित्सा)

एम. डी. (मनोविकार चिकित्सा)

(यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह 1982 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो);

(4) 'मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने, स्तम्भ (2) में, 'डा. आफ मेडिसिन (विकिरण विज्ञान)' प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (3) में उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

2	3
'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (विकिरण निदान)	एम. डी. (विकिरण निदान) (यह अर्हता तब मान्यता प्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह 14 अप्रैल, 1981 से जून 1986 तक प्रदान की गई हो)';

(5) 'पांडिचेरी विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने स्तम्भ (2) में आने वाली 'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (विकिरण निदान)' प्रविष्टि के सामने स्तम्भ (3) में '14 अप्रैल, 1981 को या उसके पश्चात् शब्दों, अंकों और अक्षरों के स्थान पर 'जुलाई, 1986 में या उसके पश्चात्' शब्द और अंक रखे जायेंगे;

(6) 'देवी अहिंसा विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने;

(i) स्तम्भ (2) में 'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (विकिरण चिकित्सा)' शब्दों और कोष्ठकों का लोप किया जायेगा;

(ii) स्तम्भ (3) में 'एम डी' (विकिरण चिकित्सा) अक्षरों, शब्दों और कोष्ठकों का लोप किया जायेगा;

(iii) स्तम्भ (2) में 'डिप्लोमा इन गार्डिनिकोलोजी और आम्बेस्ट्रिक्स' प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (3) में उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

2	3
'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (विकिरण चिकित्सा)	एम. डी. (विकिरण चिकित्सा) (यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह 1996 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो)';

(7) 'सौराष्ट्र विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने, स्तम्भ (2) में, 'मास्टर आफ सर्जरी (शरीर रचना विज्ञान)' प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (3) में उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

2	3
'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (निरोधात्मक और सामाजिक आयुर्विज्ञान)	एम. डी. (निरोधात्मक और सामाजिक आयुर्विज्ञान) (यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह अप्रैल, 1984 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो)';
डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (समुदाय आयुर्विज्ञान)	एम. डी. (समुदाय आयुर्विज्ञान) (यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह अप्रैल, 1984 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो)';

(8) 'कलकत्ता विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने स्तम्भ (2) में, 'मैजिस्टर चिरुरगियर (कार्डियो-थोरोसिक-सर्जरी)' प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (3) में उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

2	3
'मास्टर आफ सर्जरी (कर्ण-नासा-कंठ)	एम.एस. (कर्ण-नासा-कंठ) (यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह 1973 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो)';
डिप्लोमा इन ओटोलैरिंगोलोजी	डी. एल. ओ. (यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह 1964 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो)';

(9) 'नागपुर विश्वविद्यालय' के सामने, स्तम्भ (2) में, 'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (जैव रसायन विज्ञान)' प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (3) में उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात्:—

2	3
'डाक्टर आफ मेडिसिन (समुदाय आयुर्विज्ञान)	एम.डी. (समुदाय आयुर्विज्ञान) (यह अर्हता तब मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह अप्रैल, 1979 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो);

[फा.सं. बी. 11015/7/99-एमई(यूजी)]

एस.के. मिश्रा, डैस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1999

S.O. 2453.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 11 of the Indian Medical Council Act 1956 (102 of 1956) the Central Government, after consulting the Medical Council of India, hereby makes the following further amendments in the First Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

In the First Schedule to the said Act:—

(1) against the 'Aligarh Muslim University', in column under heading 'Recognised Medical Qualification' [hereinafter referred to as column (2), after the entry, 'Master of Surgery (Oto-Rhino-Laryngology)', and the entry relating thereto in column under heading 'Abbreviation for Registration (hereinafter referred to as column (3)), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Diploma in Anaesthesiology	D.A. (This qualification shall be a recognised qualification when granted in or after 1973);

(2) against the 'Punjabi University', in column (2), after the entry, 'Diploma in Sports Medicine' and the entry relating thereto in column (3), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Doctor of Medicine (Microbiology)	M.D. (Micro) (This qualification shall be a recognised medical qualification when granted on or after July, 1981);

(3) against the 'Utkal University', in column (2), after the entry 'Doctor of Medicine (T.B. and Respiratory Diseases)', and the entry relating thereto in column (3), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Doctor of Medicine (Psychiatry)	M.D. (Psychiatry) (This qualification shall be a recognised medical qualification when granted on or after 1982);

(4) against the 'University of Madras', in the column (2), after the entry, 'Doctor of Medicine (Pathology)', and the entry relating thereto in column (3), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Doctor of Medicine (Radio-Diagnosis)'	M.D. (Radio-Diagnosis) (This qualification shall be a recognised medical qualification when granted from 14th April, 1981 to June, 1986);

(5) against the 'Pondicherry University', against the entry 'Doctor of Medicine (Radio-Diagnosis) occurring in column (2), in column (3) for the words, figures, and letter 'on or after 14th April, 1981', the words and figures 'on or after July, 1986', shall be substituted:

(6) against the 'Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya;

(i) in column (2), the words and brackets, 'Doctor of Medicine (Radio-Therapy)' shall be omitted;

(ii) in column (3), the letters, brackets and word, 'M.D. (Radio-Therapy)' shall be omitted;

(iii) in column (2) after the entry, 'Diploma in Gynaecology and Obstetrics,' and the entry relating thereto in column (3), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Doctor of Medicine (Radio-Therapy)'	M.D. (Radio-Therapy) (This qualification shall be a recognised qualification when granted on or after, 1996)

(7) against the 'Saurashtra University'; in column (2), after the entry, 'Master of Surgery (Anatomy)', and the entry relating thereto in column (3), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Doctor of Medicine (Preventive and Social Medicine)'	M.D. (PSM) (This qualification shall be a recognised medical qualification when granted on or after April, 1984).
Doctor of Medicine (Community Medicine)	M.D. (Community Medicine) (This qualification shall be a recognised qualification when granted on or after April, 1984);

(8) against the 'University of Calcutta; in column (2), after the entry, 'Magister Chirurgiae (Cardio-thoracic Surgery); and the entry relating thereto in column (3), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Master of Surgery (ENT)'	M.S. (ENT) (This qualification shall be a recognised qualification when granted on or after 1973);
Diploma in Otolaryngology	D.L.O. (This qualification shall be a recognised medical qualification when granted on or after 1964)

(9) against the 'University of Nagpur', in column (2), after the entry 'Doctor of Medicine (Biochemistry)' and the entry relating thereto in column (3), the following shall be inserted, namely:—

(2)	(3)
'Doctor of Medicine (Community Medicine)'	M.D. (Community Medicine) (This qualification shall be a recognised qualification when granted on or after April, 1979).

नई दिल्ली, 24 अगस्त, 1999

इस्पात और खान मंत्रालय

(इस्पात विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2544-भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में डा. जी. शाम सुन्दर, कुलपति, एन टी आर स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय विजयवाड़ा आन्ध्र प्रदेश को एन टी आर स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, विजयवाड़ा की अकादमिक सीनेट ने 24-4-1999 को 24-4-1999 से भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद के एक सदस्य के रूप में निर्वाचित किया है।

अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार भारत सरकार के पंचवर्ती स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या सा.का. 138 दिनांक 9 जनवरी, 1960 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, नामतः

उक्त अधिसूचना में "धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) के अधीन निर्वाचित" शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत क्रम संख्या 74 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के बाद निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्या और प्रविष्टियां जोड़ी जायेंगी, नामतः

"75. डा. जी. शाम सुन्दर, एन टी आर स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, विजयवाड़ा

[स. बी.-11013/19/99-एम ई (यू.जी.)]

एस. के. मिश्रा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th August, 1999

S.O. 2544.—Whereas in pursuance of the provisions of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 3 of Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), Dr. G. Sham Sunder, Vice-Chancellor, NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada, A.P. has been elected by the Academic Senate of NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada on 24-4-99 to be a member of Medical Council of India from 24-4-1999.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health, number S.O. 138, dated the 9th January, 1960, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading, "Elected under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 3" after serial number 74 and the entries relating thereto, the following serial number and entries shall be added, namely:—

"75. Dr. G. Sham Sunder, N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada."

[No. V-11013/19/99-ME(UG)]
S. K. MISHRA, Desk Officer

का.आ. 2545-राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिये प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 (यथा संशोधित 1987) के नियम-10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा इस्पात और खान मंत्रालय (इस्पात विभाग) के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालय जिसके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारीबन्ध ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है।

स्टील अथॉरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड

केन्द्रीय विपणन संगठन, मध्य क्षेत्र

56, आर्केड, सिल्वर न्यू प्लासिया

इन्दौर-452001 (मध्य प्रदेश)

[स. ई.-11011(1)/95-हिंदी]

डा. रेणु सिंह परमार, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF STEEL & MINES

(Department of Steel)

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2545.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 (as amended 1987) the Central Government hereby notifies the following office under the Administrative control of Ministry of Steel & Mines (Department of Steel), where more than 80% staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi:—

Steel Authority of India Ltd.,
Central Marketing Organisation,
Regional Office,
56, Arcade Silver, New Plasia,
Indore-452001 (M.P.)

[No. E. 11011(1)/95-Hindi]

Dr. R. S. PARMAR, Director

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2546—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है की हरियाणा राज्य में कोडला-जामनगर-लोनी पाइप लाइन परियोजना के माध्यम से तरल पेट्रोलियम गैस के परिवहन के लिए गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइप लाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रतीत होता है कि उक्त पाइप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उस भूमि में जिसमें उक्त पाइप लाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है, इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधि-कार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है;

2564 GI/99-7.

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962, (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है,

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हतबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध कराए जाने की तारीख से इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि में पाइप लाइन बिछाने के संबंध में आक्षेप, लिखित रूप में सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड, ए-112, सेक्टर-26, नोएडा, गौतमबुद्धनगर (उ.प्र.) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	ग्राम	गाटा सं.	अर्जित किया गया क्षेत्र (हेक्टर.)	विवरण
1	2	3	4	5	6
फरीदाबाद	बल्लभगढ़	व्याला	53/7	0.1600	
			53/4	0.0037	
			53/5	0.1300	
			53/6	0.0350	
			54/1	0.1600	
			54/2	0.1005	
			54/3/1	0.0278	
			54/3/2	0.0025	
			46/22	0.0605	
			46/23	0.1300	
			46/24	0.1600	
			46/25	0.1600	
			46/16	0.0020	
			46/20	0.0850	
			45/21	0.0600	
			सड़क	0.0410	
			45/19	0.0845	
			45/12	0.1150	
			45/9	0.0432	
			45/8	0.1001	
			45/3	0.1146	
			40/23/2	0.0730	
			40/24	0.0520	
			40/17	0.1140	
			40/14	0.1110	
			40/15	0.0030	
			सड़क	0.0390	
			44/22	0.0916	
			44/23	0.0052	
			44/19	0.1000	
			44/12	0.1000	
			44/9	0.1006	
			44/2	0.1000	
			41/22	0.0750	

1	2	3	4	5	6
			41/21	0.0280	
			41/19	0.0129	
			41/20	0.0900	
			41/11	0.0800	
			सड़क	0.0450	
		योग	39	2.9957	

[सं. एल.-14014/3/99-जी. पी.]

सुनील कुमार सिंह, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1999

S.O. 2546.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of Liquid Petroleum Gas through Kandla-Jamnagar-Loni Pipeline Project in Haryana State, a pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Limited;

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to the competent authority, Gas Authority of India Limited, A-112, Sector-26, Noida, Gautam Buddha Nagar (U.P.)

SCHEDULE

District	Tehsil	Village	Plot No.	Acquired Area in Hectare	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
Faridabad	Ballabhgarh	Pyala	53/7	0.1600	
			53/4	0.0037	
			53/5	0.1300	
			53/6	0.0350	
			54/1	0.1600	
			54/2	0.1005	
			54/3/1	0.0278	

1	2	3	4	5	6
			54/3/2	0.0025	
			46/22	0.0605	
			46/23	0.1300	
			46/24	0.1600	
			46/25	0.1600	
			46/16	0.0020	
			46/20	0.0850	
			45/21	0.0600	
			Road	0.0410	
			45/19	0.0845	
			45/12	0.1150	
			45/9	0.0432	
			45/8	0.1001	
			45/3	0.1146	
			40/23/2	0.0730	
			40/24	0.0520	
			40/17	0.1140	
			40/14	0.1110	
			40/15	0.0030	
			Road	0.0390	
			44/22	0.0916	
			44/23	0.0052	
			44/19	0.1000	
			44/12	0.1000	
			44/9	0.1006	
			44/2	0.1000	
			41/22	0.0750	
			41/21	0.0280	
			41/19	0.0129	
			41/20	0.0900	
			41/11	0.0800	
			Road	0.0450	
		Total	39	2.9957	

[No. L-14014/3/99-G.P.]

S.K. SINGH, Under Sec

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 6 सितम्बर, 1999

का. आ. 2547.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि मोटर स्पीट, उच्चकोटि किरोसिन तेल और उच्चवर्ग डीजल के भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड इरमपानम् कोचीन, संस्थापन से तमिलनाडु राज्य के करूर में परिवहन के लिए पेट्रोनेट सी.सी.के. लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछायी जानी चाहिए।

और ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 की 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है।

अतः उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को उपलब्ध करा दिए जाने की तारीख से इक्कीस दिन के भीतर इनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या सक्षम प्राधिकारी के अधीन भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में आक्षेप, लिखित रूप में श्री ए. टी. जेम्स, सक्षम प्राधिकारी कोचीन, कोयम्बटूर, करूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना गोल्डन प्लाजा, एनेक्स, चित्तूर रोड़, कोचीन, 18, केरल राज्य, पिन-682 018 को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालुका - कन्यानूर

जिला - अर्नाकुलम

राज्य - केरल

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	क्षेत्र		
		हेक्टर	आरे	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5
थरीक्काकारा	195/2	0	01	00
उत्तरी	193/10	0	03	00
(खण्ड सं० 6)	193/13	0	03	00
	192/2	0	01	00
	192/10	0	02	00
	192/8	0	02	00
	189/7	0	02	00
	189/6	0	02	00
	189/13	0	02	00
	189/14	0	02	00
	189/15	0	02	00
	198/2	0	02	00
	198/4	0	02	00
	188/7	0	02	00
	188/12	0	03	00
	173/8	0	03	00
	155/2	0	02	00
	155/3	0	02	00
	155/4	0	02	00
	154/2	0	02	00
	154/3	0	02	00
	154/1	0	02	00
	152/7	0	03	00
	152/10	0	03	00
	152/4	0	01	00
	151/11	0	03	00
	151/12	0	02	00
	151/13	0	03	00
	151/14	0	03	00
	151/9	0	01	00
	85/5	0	03	00
	85/9	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

तालुका - अलुवा

अलुवा पश्चिमी (खण्ड सं० 34)	5/11	0	01	00
	5/8	0	01	00
	6/2	0	01	00
	6/3	0	01	00
	7/2	0	01	00
	7/3	0	01	00

पाराकाडाव (खण्ड सं० 5)	86/1	0	00	23
	111/4	0	00	04
	161/5	0	05	36
	115/18	0	00	03
	123	0	15	58
	124	0	05	50
	135	0	15	00
	136	0	20	00
	148	0	09	00
	149	0	24	00
	31	0	22	00
	162	0	22	00
	39	0	04	00
	38	0	04	00
	36	0	04	00
	36	0	04	00
	30	0	04	00
	29	0	04	00
	24	0	04	00
	116	0	04	00
	83/12	0	00	03
	82/13	0	00	22

पाराकाडाव (खण्ड सं० 6)	459/3	0	00	15
	249/11	0	02	28
	309/4	0	00	15
	343/15	0	00	74
	429/4	0	00	61
	458/9	0	00	94
	249/14	0	05	84
	342/4	0	00	05
	362	0	12	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	359	0	10	00
	429	0	04	50
	430	0	08	25
	422/1	0	02	58

तालुका - पारावुर

काडुंगालुर	199/18	0	02	00
	199/13	0	04	00
	222/7	0	02	00
	228/11	0	04	05
	228/9	0	06	00
	228/8	0	06	00
	229/6	0	02	00
	235/2	0	02	00
	235/1	0	02	00
	239/5	0	02	00
	256/1	0	02	00
	256/6	0	02	00
	257/4	0	03	00
	1/5	0	02	00
	2/1	0	01	00
	3/6	0	02	00
	4/1	0	15	00
	4/3 to 7	0	30	00
	22/1 to 2	0	12	50
	22/4 to 6,11	0	50	00
	19/1 to 7	0	64	00
	18/2, 5	0	04	00
	14/7, 8	0	13	50
	144/21	0	02	00
	144/20	0	01	00
	147/16	0	03	00
कारुमालुर	431	0	20	00
	73/5	0	04	00
	72/2	0	03	00
	73/7	0	02	00
	60/3	0	07	00
	62/8	0	02	00
	64/6	0	04	25
	59/8	0	02	00

New Delhi, 6th September, 1999

S. O. 2547.— Whereas it appears to the central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of Motor Spirit, Superior Kerosene Oil and High Speed Diesel from Irimpanam Installalon of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Irimpanam, Cochin in the State of Kerala to Karur in the State of Tamil Nadu, a pipeline should be laid by Petronet C.C.K. Limited;

And, whereas, for the purpose of laying such pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the lands described in the schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in the exercise of powers conferred by sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User In Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in lands described in the said schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Sri. A.T. James, competent authority (Kerala), Cochin-Colmbatore-Karur Pipeline Project, Golden Plaza Annexe, Chittoor Road, Cochin - 18, Kerala State, Pin - 682 018.

SCHEDULE

STATE : KERALA

DISTRICT : ERNAKULAM

TALUK : KANAYANNUR

VILLAGE	SURVEY NUMBERS	AREA (APPROX.)		
		HECTARES	ARES	SQ.MTRS.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
THRIKKAKARA (N) (BLOCK NO. 6)	195/2	0	01	00
	193/10	0	03	00
	193/13	0	03	00
	192/2	0	01	00
	192/10	0	02	00
	192/8	0	02	00
	189/7	0	02	00
	189/6	0	02	00
	189/13	0	02	00
	189/14	0	02	00
	189/15	0	02	00
	198/2	0	02	00
	198/4	0	02	00
	188/7	0	02	00
	188/12	0	03	00
	173/8	0	03	00
	155/2	0	02	00
	155/3	0	02	00
	155/4	0	02	00
	154/2	0	02	00
	154/3	0	02	00
	154/1	0	02	00
	152/7	0	03	00
	152/10	0	03	00
	152/4	0	01	00
	151/11	0	03	00
	151/12	0	02	00
	151/13	0	03	00
	151/14	0	03	00
	151/9	0	01	00
	85/5	0	03	00
	85/9	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

TALUK : ALUVA**ALUVA WEST
(BLOCK NO. 34)**

5/11	0	01	00
5/8	0	01	00
6/2	0	01	00
6/3	0	01	00
7/2	0	01	00
7/3	0	01	00

**PARAKKADAVU
(BLOCK NO. 5)**

86/1	0	00	23
111/4	0	00	04
161/5	0	05	36
115/18	0	00	03
123	0	15	58
124	0	05	50
135	0	15	00
136	0	20	00
148	0	09	00
149	0	24	00
31	0	22	00
162	0	22	00
39	0	04	00
38	0	04	00
36	0	04	00
35	0	04	00
30	0	04	00
29	0	04	00
24	0	04	00
116	0	04	00
83/12	0	00	03
82/13	0	00	22

**PARAKKADAVU
(BLOCK NO. 6)**

459/3	0	00	15
249/11	0	02	28
309/4	0	00	15
343/15	0	00	74
429/4	0	00	61
458/9	0	00	94
249/14	0	05	84
342/4	0	00	05
362	0	12	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	359	0	10	90
	429	0	04	50
	430	0	08	25
	422/1	0	02	58

TALUK : PARAVUR

KADUNGALLUR	199/18	0	02	00
	199/13	0	04	00
	222/7	0	02	00
	228/11	0	04	00
	228/9	0	06	00
	228/8	0	06	00
	229/6	0	02	00
	235/2	0	02	00
	235/1	0	02	00
	239/5	0	02	00
	256/1	0	02	00
	256/6	0	02	00
	257/4	0	03	00
	1/5	0	02	00
	2/1	0	01	00
	3/6	0	02	00
	4/1	0	15	00
	4/3 to 7	0	30	00
	22/1 to 2	0	12	50
	22/4 to 6,11	0	50	00
	19/1 to 7	0	64	00
	18/2, 5	0	04	00
	14/7, 8	0	13	50
	144/21	0	02	00
	144/20	0	01	00
	147/16	0	03	00
KARUMALLUR	431	0	20	00
	73/5	0	04	00
	72/2	0	03	00
	73/7	0	02	00
	60/3	0	07	00
	62/8	0	02	00
	64/6	0	04	25
	59/8	0	02	00

नई दिल्ली, 6 सितम्बर, 1999

का. आ. 2548.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि मोटर स्पीड, उच्चकोटि किरोसिन तेल और उच्चवर्ग डीजल के भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड इरमपानम् कोचीन, संस्थापन से तमिलनाडु राज्य के करूर में परिवहन के लिए पेट्रोनेट सी.सी.के. लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछायी जानी चाहिए ।

और ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 की 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है।

अतः उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को उपलब्ध करा दिए जाने की तारीख से इक्कीस दिन के भीतर इनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या सक्षम प्राधिकारी के अधीन भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में आक्षेप, लिखित रूप में श्री ए. टी. जेम्स, सक्षम प्राधिकारी कोचीन, कोयम्बटूर, करूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना गोल्डन प्लाजा, एनेक्स, चित्तूर रोड़, कोचीन, 18, केरल राज्य, पिन-682 018 को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

राज्य - केरल

जिला - पालाकाड

तालुका - आलाथुर

क्षेत्र (लगभग)

गाँव

सर्वेक्षण संख्या

हेक्टेयर

आरे

वर्गमीटर

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

कानाम्बरा - II

(खण्ड सं० - 34)

607/11

0

40

45

658/3

0

00

15

658/1

0

03

10

658/2

0

03

10

658/11

0

03

20

658/5

0

02

90

660/4

0

01

18

660/2

0

04

15

661/1

0

01

37

661/2

0

03

27

661/3

0

18

60

661/5

0

02

43

662/1

0

07

21

662/2

0

06

07

662/3

0

03

00

662/4

0

01

00

662/5

0

12

20

663/4

0

04

05

663/5

0

02

02

664/5

0

01

09

664/8

0

01

08

664/6

0

01

09

664/7

0

01

10

665/1

0

03

20

665/2

0

12

14

665/5

0

08

09

665/3

0

08

10

665/4

0

09

80

666/1

0

02

10

666/5

0

03

90

666/8

0

02

80

666/9

0

02

00

666/10

0

01

00

667/4

0

05

00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	667/5	0	03	00
	667/6	0	13	00
	176	0	02	00
	175/7	0	34	00
	175/8	0	09	00
	175/9	0	04	00
	174/7	0	11	80
बडाकेन्वरी - I (खण्ड सं0 - 34)	668/1	0	10	00
	669/7	0	02	02
	669/5	0	04	05
	669/6	0	04	00
	669/2	0	04	02
	669/3	0	02	01
	669/10	0	00	40
	669/11	0	08	06
	670/5	0	11	00
	670/8	0	10	06
	670/9	0	09	50
	670/6	0	01	01
	671/6	0	13	00
	671/7	0	11	00
	671/5	0	01	00
	676	0	02	06
	677/2	0	18	00
	677/3	0	01	00
	677/4	0	14	00
	677/1	0	01	00
	678/1	0	00	80
	678/3	0	01	00
	679	0	00	60
	692/1	0	02	00
	692/8	0	01	50
कानाम्बरा - I (खण्ड सं0 - 36)	8/1	1	48	00
	8/8	0	01	00
	9/1	0	10	00
	10/1	0	03	00
	10/2	0	05	00
	10/11	0	28	00
	10/3	0	03	00
	12/4	0	01	12
	12/5	0	01	05
	12/7	0	05	00
	12/6	0	20	00
	12/1	1	40	00
	12/8	0	03	00
	12/9	0	01	00
	12/2	0	01	05
	13/1	0	05	00
	14/1	0	01	06
	14/2	0	01	14
	15/1	1	00	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	15/4	1	20	00
	15/2	0	01	00
	15/3A	0	01	05
	15/9	0	08	00
	36/1	0	18	00
	36/8	0	08	00
	36/5	0	03	00
	36/12	0	13	00
	36/13	0	07	07
	36/14	0	28	00
	36/3	0	12	00
	36/4	0	02	00
	36/16	0	01	00
	36/9	0	01	04
	39/2	0	18	00
	39/3	0	04	00
	39/7	0	01	05
	39/13	0	12	00
	39/12	0	12	50
	39/4	0	06	00
	39/5	0	03	00
	39/9	0	13	00
	39/8	0	12	00
	46/4	0	38	00
	46/5	0	01	00
	46/8	0	02	00
	47/2	0	10	00
	48/2	2	40	00
	48/1	0	01	00
	48/5	0	01	12
	49/1	0	00	90
	49/2	0	01	00
	49/12	0	01	00
	49/11	0	02	00
	49/3	0	01	00
	49/5	0	10	00
	49/10	0	01	00
	49/8	0	02	00
	50/1	0	02	00
	50/3	0	80	00
	50/2	0	28	00
	50/4	0	01	00
	50/5	0	04	00
	76/7	0	02	00
	76/2	0	03	00
	76/14	0	28	00
	76/6	0	02	00
	77/5	0	08	00
	78/1	0	20	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	78/6	0	28	00
	78/9	0	04	00
	78/10	0	01	00
	78/7	0	04	00
	78/12	0	01	00
	79	0	80	00
	80/1	0	15	00
	80/17	0	02	00
	80/2	0	01	00
	80/20	0	01	25
	80/3	0	01	30
	80/4	0	01	40
	80/5	0	02	32
	80/8	0	02	40
	80/6	0	01	20
	81/15	0	09	00
	81/18	0	02	00
	81/14	0	01	00
	81/19	0	09	00
	81/20	0	02	00
	81/3	0	14	00
	81/29	0	02	00
	81/23	0	05	00
	81/28	0	24	00
	81/26	0	01	00
	81/27	0	01	00
	81/32	0	08	25
	81/35	0	06	15
	81/36	0	04	00
	81/37	0	01	00
	81/38	0	01	00
	81/41	0	06	00
	81/39	0	02	00
	81/40	0	01	00
	81/42	0	11	00
	81/43	0	01	00
	81/44	0	12	00
	81/1	0	01	00
	82	0	20	00
	95/1	0	28	00
	95/2	0	06	00
	95/8	0	18	00
	95/9	0	04	00
	95/10	0	12	00
	95/11	0	24	00
	95/12	0	38	00
	95/3	0	04	00
	96/2	0	04	00
	96/1	0	04	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	103/3	0	06	66
	103/4	0	01	00
	103/7	0	01	21
	103/8	0	00	60
	104/9	0	28	76
	104/2	0	21	60
	104/4	0	01	00
	104/5	0	02	02
	105/2	0	40	47
	107/1	0	02	00
	107/2	0	44	10
	107/5	0	02	00
	108/5	0	10	26
	108/2	0	11	70
	108/6	0	08	10
	108/1	0	02	10
	109/2	0	02	00
	109/3	0	08	10
	109/4	0	03	84
	109/7	0	03	00
	109/5	0	09	90
	110/4	0	01	00
	110/2	0	12	60
	110/3	0	03	24
	110/9	0	02	00
	110/5	0	07	92
	110/7	0	00	72
	110/10	0	02	02
	122/1	0	06	07
	122/2	0	02	90
	113/1	0	01	00
	113/2	0	02	00
	113/3	0	01	00
कानाम्बरा - I (खण्ड सं0 - 34)	173	0	29	00
कानाम्बरा - I (खण्ड सं0 - 35)	314/2	0	04	02
	314/3	0	04	05
	381	0	05	00
	383/4	0	06	00
	383/3	0	01	05
	384/1	0	15	00
	384/4	0	02	00
	384/2	0	03	00
	384/3	0	02	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	385/5	0	08	00
	385/3	0	01	00
	386/4	0	02	00
	386/7	0	10	00
	386/5	0	03	00
	386/6	0	01	02
	386/3	0	03	00
	386/2	0	01	02
	387/1	0	04	00
	388/2	0	01	00
	388/5	0	25	77
	388/8	0	01	00
	388/7	0	01	05
	389	0	02	05
	390	0	02	02
	392	0	01	00
	393	0	01	02
	394/1	0	01	00
	394/7	0	01	03
	394/8	0	01	01
	394/6	0	01	02
	394/9	0	01	00
	394/2	0	01	00
	400/1	0	01	00
	400/2	0	01	02
	400/3	0	01	03
	400/4	0	01	02
	401/10	0	08	00
	401/1	0	02	00
	402/1	0	15	00
	403/3	0	06	00
	403/6	0	03	00
	408/1	0	03	00
	408/2	0	05	00
	408/3	0	06	00
	410	0	28	00
	411/1	0	22	00
	412/1	0	03	00
	412/2	0	02	00
	412/5	0	02	75
	412/6	0	03	75
	412/7	0	04	25
	413/1	0	08	00
	413/2	0	03	02
	413/3	0	03	01
	413/8	0	01	02
	414/1	0	02	00
	415/2	0	01	00
	415/3	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	415/4	0	03	00
	416/5	0	01	02
	438/1	0	03	00
	438/3	0	01	00
	438/5	0	01	00
	439	0	02	00
	440	0	03	00
	441	0	02	00
	442/1	0	06	00
	442/2	0	02	00
	442/5	0	01	00
	442/6	0	02	01
	443/1	0	02	00
	443/2	0	02	01
	443/3	0	09	00
	443/4	0	12	00
	443/5	0	02	00
	443/6	0	01	00
	443/7	0	08	00
	443/8	0	01	00
	446/3	0	01	00
	446/2	0	01	00
	446/4	0	06	00
	446/5	0	04	00
	447/3	0	01	00
	447/4	0	02	00
	448/1	0	01	00
	448/2	0	01	75
	448/3	0	03	00
	449	0	03	00
	450	0	03	00
	451/1	0	01	00
	451/2	0	03	00
	451/3	0	04	00
	452/20	0	10	00
	452/1	0	08	00
	452/5	0	03	00
	452/21	0	02	00
	453	0	02	00
	460/7	0	06	00
	460/2	0	05	00
	460/8	0	02	00
	460/3	0	05	00
	460/9	0	01	00
	460/4	0	01	75
	460/5	0	02	00
	460/6	0	01	00
	461/1	0	02	00
	461/2	0	02	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	461/3	0	01	00
	462	0	02	00
बडाकेल्बरी - II	19/2	0	02	02
(खण्ड सं0 - 46)	19/3	0	03	20
	19/4	0	04	00
	19/5	0	02	02
	19/13	0	01	08
	19/14	0	03	00
	19/15	0	04	05
	19/16	0	09	00
	20	0	04	05
	21	0	01	82
	22/2	0	02	02
	22/3	0	03	24
	22/4	0	01	08
	28/9	0	01	21
	28/11	0	01	35
	28/12	0	02	98
	28/13	0	04	05
	28/15	0	03	34
	29/1	0	01	10
	29/2	0	01	00
	29/4	0	03	18
	29/5	0	03	24
	29/6	0	03	40
	30/1	0	01	00
	30/2	0	03	10
	30/3	0	03	90
	30/4	0	05	10
	30/5	0	00	32
	30/6	0	05	05
	30/7	0	02	14
	30/8	0	04	05
	30/9	0	04	45
	30/10	0	04	05
	31/1	0	03	18
	31/2	0	04	09
	34/1	0	04	35
	34/2	0	03	40
	34/4	0	00	90
	34/5	0	01	21
	34/6	0	06	17
	34/7	0	03	99
	34/8	0	00	25
	34/10	0	01	00
	34/11	0	01	45
	34/12	0	01	60
	34/13	0	01	71

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	34/14	0	01	62
	35/6	0	03	10
	36/1	0	02	02
	36/2	0	08	10
	40/1	0	05	14
	40/2	0	08	22
	40/3	0	04	35
	40/4	0	02	26
	40/5	0	07	00
	40/6	0	04	05
	41/2	0	02	43
	41/3	0	01	19
	42/1	0	05	10
	42/2	0	17	22
	42/3	0	00	30
	42/4	0	00	28
	42/5	0	08	00
	45	0	02	10
	53/1	0	05	00
	53/2	0	06	07
	53/3	0	04	05
	53/4	0	01	21
	53/5	0	01	00
	54/1	0	02	10
	54/2	0	02	30
	137	0	04	00
	138	0	03	50
	140/1	0	04	05
	140/2	0	08	09
	140/3	0	00	40
	141/1	0	02	02
	141/2	0	09	20
	141/3	0	01	31
	141/4	0	03	14
	143/1	0	01	13
	143/4	0	01	00
	143/5	0	01	41
	143/6	0	02	43
	143/7	0	02	10
	143/8	0	02	00
	148/1	0	01	18
	148/2	0	08	09
	148/3	0	02	18
	148/4	0	02	19
	149/1	0	30	00
	149/2	0	01	60
	150	0	02	63
	159/1	0	08	09
	159/3	0	15	08

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	160/11	0	02	37
	160/2	0	01	18
	160/5	0	00	36
	161/1	0	06	14
	161/2	0	06	07
	161/3	0	00	28
	161/4	0	01	21
	162/1	0	01	90
	162/4	0	06	10
	162/5	0	01	21
बढाकेन्द्री - II (खण्ड सं० - 45)	207/3	0	48	00
	207/19	0	45	00
	207/18	0	45	00
	207/17	0	45	00
	207/16	0	45	01
	207/4	0	01	00
	207/5	0	02	00
	207/6	0	03	00
	207/7	0	01	00
	207/2	0	03	00
	207/10	0	04	00
	207/11	0	04	05
	208/1	0	06	00
	208/2	0	02	00
	208/3	0	02	04
	208/4	0	01	02
	209/1	0	03	00
	211/2	0	04	00
	211/1	0	01	00
	206/0	0	05	00
	243/1	0	10	00
	243/2	0	18	00
	243/4	0	01	00
	243/3	0	01	00
	244/3	0	03	00
	244/4	0	06	50
	244/5	0	03	00
	244/6	0	08	00
	244/7	0	04	00
	244/2	0	03	00
	245	0	15	00
	247/9	0	08	00
	247/10	0	02	00
	248/2	0	03	00
	248/10	0	02	00
	248/11	0	08	00
	248/3	0	02	00
	248/12	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	248/4	0	02	00
	248/5	0	04	00
	248/9	0	02	00
	248/6	0	18	00
	250/1	0	02	00
	250/3	0	04	00
	250/2	0	01	00
	250/7	0	13	00
	250/8	0	02	00
	250/9	0	01	00
बडाकेन्दरी - II (खण्ड सं० - 44)	8	0	02	02
	9/1	0	01	00
	9/2	0	08	10
	9/3	0	14	94
	9/4	0	03	28
	9/5	0	02	48
	10/1	0	04	68
	10/2	0	05	94
	10/4	0	01	10
	10/5	0	02	02
	10/6	0	05	09
	10/7	0	01	90
	10/8	0	01	08
	11/2	0	08	10
	11/3	0	01	60
	11/4	0	16	00
	12/2	0	02	02
	12/3	0	02	43
	12/4	0	02	63
	19	0	02	08
	20	0	03	60
	21/3	0	03	40
	21/5	0	05	40
	21/7	0	02	24
	21/8	0	00	80
	21/9	0	01	02
	21/10	0	02	63
	22/6	0	02	98
	22/7	0	02	63
	22/8	0	04	68
	23/1	0	05	30
	23/2	0	07	20
	23/3	0	06	20
	23/4	0	01	08
	23/6	0	02	02
	23/7	0	01	02

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	23/8	0	01	90
	23/12	0	02	43
	24	0	03	10
	27/1	0	05	40
	27/2	0	02	02
	27/3	0	07	18
	27/4	0	06	48
	34/7	0	03	60
	34	0	03	00
	37/1	0	03	60
	37/2	0	07	20
	37/3	0	03	90
	37/11	0	01	18
	37/16	0	02	02
	38/2	0	04	50
	38/3	0	02	02
	38/4	0	12	60
	38/5	0	02	17
	38/8	0	05	40
	38/9	0	04	86
	39/3	0	03	24
	39/7	0	06	48
	39/8	0	03	10
	44/9	0	01	00
	44/10	0	05	90
	44/11	0	01	00
	44/12	0	02	80
	392/1	0	04	86
	392/2	0	01	62
	392/7	0	05	40
	392/8	0	02	02
	392/9	0	00	15
	392/10	0	02	48
	393/1	0	14	40
	393/2	0	02	43
	393/3	0	01	00
	393/4	0	11	34
	393/5	0	01	02
	393/6	0	01	60
	393/7	0	00	80
	393/8	0	01	10
	45/1	0	01	00
	45/2	0	07	20
	45/3	0	00	10
	45/5	0	03	10
	45/6	0	05	40
	45/7	0	02	00
	45/8	0	02	02
	45/9	0	01	21

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	45/10	0	01	82
	46/1	0	02	63
	46/2	0	03	24
	48/1	0	01	14
	48/2	0	01	00
	48/3	0	01	72
	48/4	0	02	63
	48/5	0	01	72
	48/6	0	02	90
	48/10	0	02	10
बडाकेन्चरी - I (खण्ड सं0 - 44)	80/11	0	02	00
	80/12	0	03	02
	80/1	0	01	00
	80/2	0	02	00
	80/13	0	02	03
	80/15	0	02	00
	80/16	0	01	00
	80/17	0	02	00
	80/18	0	01	00
	80/3	0	01	00
	81/4	0	01	10
	81/13	0	01	02
	81/14	0	01	00
	81/6	0	08	00
	81/9	0	01	03
	81/3	0	02	04
	81/10	0	02	07
	81/2	0	01	00
	81/4	0	02	00
	82/1	0	04	00
	82/2	0	08	00
	82/3	0	03	20
	82/8	0	00	50
	82/5	0	06	40
	82/6	0	10	00
	82/18	0	01	00
	82/20	0	01	02
	82/15	0	01	03
	82/19	0	01	10
	82/7	0	01	00
	82/9	0	03	00
	82/10	0	01	00
	82/11	0	01	02
	82/21	0	01	00
	85/1	0	04	00
	85/2	0	03	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	85/3	0	01	02
	85/4	0	04	01
	86/7	0	02	00
	86/19	0	01	80
	86/20	0	01	40
	86/22	0	00	40
	86/21	0	01	00
	86/9	0	09	00
	87/5	0	03	24
	88	0	05	20
	90	0	04	25
	98	0	04	10
	104	0	05	00
	111/1	0	00	90
	111/8	0	00	10
	111/2	0	09	00
	111/9	0	03	24
	111/4	0	01	00
	111/3	0	04	00
	111/7	0	02	07
	111/5	0	03	60
	111/6	0	02	90
	110/1	0	01	20
	110/10	0	03	15
	110/2	0	04	10
	110/4	0	00	90
	107/5	0	04	50
	107/6	0	00	15
	107/7	0	04	10
	107/9	0	06	84
	107/8	0	01	40
	109/1	0	04	50
	109/2	0	05	38
	108/2	0	16	20
	108/5	0	02	00
	108/9	0	01	02
कावासेरी - I (खण्ड सं0 - 30)	162/9	0	00	80
	162/11	0	00	30
	163/2	0	05	35
	163/4	0	07	30
	166/1	0	01	72
	166/2	0	25	00
	167/1	0	02	10
	167/3	0	03	05
	168/4	0	05	30
	168/5	0	17	42
	190/5	0	05	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	190/6	0	02	32
	190/9	0	01	40
	190/12	0	00	80
	191/5	0	15	10
	195	0	01	20
	196/3	0	05	85
	196/4	0	06	75
	196/5	0	05	90
	197/1	0	05	40
	197/3	0	06	65
	197/6	0	04	75
	197/7	0	01	95
	197/8	0	02	10
	197/9	0	02	15
	202/1	0	00	30
	202/2	0	01	40
	202/3	0	04	75
	202/4	0	04	45
	202/6	0	07	56
	203	0	04	80
	237/2	0	13	25
	237/5	0	10	18
	236/3	0	03	08
	238/3	0	02	10
	239/3	0	08	10
	239/4	0	10	12
	239/5	0	03	29
	239/7	0	00	75
	240/3	0	06	07
	240/4	0	03	00
	240/5	0	08	40
	240/6	0	00	35
	241/8	0	05	60
	241/9	0	02	65
	241/10	0	04	15
	241/13	0	00	75
	242/1	0	00	90
	249/1	0	00	70
	249/2	0	01	08
	249/3	0	01	35
	249/4	0	02	10
	428/1	0	01	05
	272/3	0	04	05
	273/1	0	02	90
	273/3	0	02	00
	273/4	0	01	21
	273/5	0	00	15
	248	0	02	00
	428/1	0	01	05
	428/5	0	06	15
कावासेरी - II	429/1	0	03	86
(खण्ड सं० - 30)	429/4	0	06	85

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	429/5	0	03	10
	429/6	0	13	80
	430/1	0	02	10
	430/2	0	02	24
	430/3	0	04	05
	430/5	0	06	07
	430/8	0	08	12
	431/1	0	01	40
	431/2	0	01	15
	431/3	0	08	00
	431/4	0	08	10
	431/6	0	00	35
	433/1	0	02	15
	433/2	0	00	30
	433/5	0	00	35
	434/1	0	04	10
	434/2	0	02	60
	434/3	0	07	21
	434/6	0	03	24
	434/7	0	06	07
	434/8	0	03	10
	434/14	0	02	40
	434/15	0	00	36
	435/12	0	04	05
	435/13	0	05	20
	436/3	0	04	26
	436/4	0	06	08
	437/3	0	03	24
	437/4	0	00	25
	438/4	0	04	05
	438/5	0	01	60
	438/9	0	02	10
	438/11	0	01	21
	458/23	0	07	60
	474	0	01	82
	666/4	0	02	40
	666/5	0	08	60
	667/2	0	08	09
	667/3	0	00	30
	668/3	0	02	10
	668/4	0	00	30
	671/2	0	08	09
	671/5	0	02	43
	672/1	0	01	21
	672/2	0	03	24
	673/1	0	03	10
	673/2	0	03	00
	673/3	0	01	95
	674	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	675/2	0	02	00
	676/1	0	05	14
	676/2	0	01	06
	677/1	0	04	05
	677/2	0	04	05
	678/1	0	01	00
	678/2	0	01	06
	678/3	0	02	02
	678/4	0	02	02
	678/9	0	01	08
	680	0	08	10
कावासेरी - I	366	0	04	00
(खण्ड सं० - 29)	367/1	0	01	10
	367/2	0	01	30
	367/3	0	06	00
	367/4	0	09	50
	367/5	0	02	00
	368/3	0	01	00
	369/1	0	00	85
	369/2	0	00	60
	369/3	0	07	80
	370/1	0	15	50
	375	0	12	00
	325	0	01	00
	378/1	0	00	20
	378/2	0	26	60
	379/1	0	10	00
	379/2	0	09	00
	379/3	0	01	20
	425/1	0	03	00
	426/1	0	01	00
	426/2	0	04	50
	427/2	0	02	06
	427/5	0	04	00
	428/2	0	01	25
	428/3	0	01	00
	428/4	0	02	50
	428/5	0	03	00
	428/6	0	08	00
	428/8	0	02	10
	428/13	0	03	15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	428/17	0	05	00
	428/18	0	01	06
	428/19	0	00	40
	428/20	0	07	50
	437/1	0	06	00
	437/2	0	05	00
	437/3	0	01	00
	437/4	0	00	98
	508/5	0	00	95
	508/7	0	01	00
	508/8	0	02	10
	509/2	0	03	00
	509/6	0	01	04
	509/7	0	00	80
	509/8	0	01	03
	509/9	0	00	60
	527/2	0	24	10
	539/2	0	06	00
	539/3	0	02	10
	539/4	0	01	00
	541/1	0	00	80
	541/2	0	03	00
	541/3	0	04	10
	541/4	0	00	70
	569/1	0	03	80
	569/2	0	01	00
	569/4	0	08	50
	569/5	0	02	00
	569/6	0	06	00
	569/7	0	01	00
	573/1	0	02	00
	574/1	0	06	50
	511/6	0	00	80
	511/7	0	01	15
	511/8	0	01	35
	511/9	0	06	00
	512/1	0	01	00
	512/2	0	04	00
	513/1	0	00	10
	513/2	0	09	50
	513/4	0	03	00
	513/5	0	02	00
	513/6	0	00	80
	529	0	00	86
	483	0	00	60
	540/1	0	01	0
	540/2	0	01	50
	540/3	0	03	50
	540/6	0	05	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	540/7	0	02	00
	540/8	0	06	00
	542/1	0	09	00
	542/2	0	01	00
	542/5	0	02	00
	542/7	0	06	60
	575/2	0	00	62
	575/3	0	01	00
	575/4	0	03	00
	575/5	0	08	00
	575/6	0	02	00
	575/7	0	01	00
	576	0	03	00
	377	0	12	14
	380/1	0	04	80
	419/1	0	13	80
	429/2	0	06	80
	436/3	0	13	60
	436/4	0	05	00
	514/6	0	03	10
	515/7	0	01	00
	528	0	00	50
	530	0	03	60
	531	0	02	40
	543/1	0	01	20
	577/1	0	02	00
	577/5	0	00	80
आलाधूर (खण्ड सं० - 28)	144/1	0	02	25
	144/2	0	11	30
	144/3	0	08	50
	147/1	0	03	50
	184/7	0	02	20
	184/8	0	02	80
	185/0	0	05	00
	193/1	0	02	00
	193/4	0	03	40
	193/5	0	01	20
	193/6	0	04	00
	193/8	0	01	30
	193/9	0	04	25
	193/10	0	00	96
	193/11	0	00	95
	193/16	0	00	80
	193/17	0	01	00
	194/1	0	08	80
	190/3	0	02	00
	190/4	0	02	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	191/1	0	02	20
	192/2	0	00	30
	191/7	0	02	80
	191/8	0	03	10
	191/10	0	03	80
	191/11	0	00	20
	192/1	0	04	20
	192/3	0	04	80
	192/4	0	01	80
	192/5	0	03	40
	192/7	0	01	00
	208/1	0	02	25
	208/2	0	06	80
	208/5	0	02	00
	208/6	0	01	00
	208/7	0	02	24
	208/9	0	04	75
	208/10	0	00	98
	105/2	0	00	24
	65/15	0	01	05
	65/16	0	02	18
	65/5	0	02	08
	65/6	0	03	15
	65/7	0	01	80
	65/10	0	01	00
	63	0	02	00
ऐरीमयूर (खण्ड सं0 - 21)	46/1	0	08	07
	47/1	0	28	75
	47/2	0	07	86
	47/3	0	02	11
	48	0	01	00
	56/2	0	06	17
	56/3	0	05	56
	56/4	0	00	21
	81/5	0	00	22
	82/11	0	00	51
	115	0	02	10
	116/6	0	05	44
	116/7	0	00	73
	119	0	00	51
	120	0	02	47
	126/3	0	00	36
	61	0	02	10
	60	0	03	88
	57	0	01	10
	45	0	02	20
	44	0	02	25

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कोजालमन्म - I				
(खण्ड सं0 - 17)				
	288/7	0	00	36
	289/1	0	15	85
	289/2	0	13	44
	291/1	0	06	00
	291/2	0	04	80
	291/3	0	00	40
	291/6	0	01	40
	292/1	0	01	30
	292/2	0	01	30
	292/3	0	00	40
	292/4	0	04	70
	292/7	0	10	30
	292/8	0	04	25
	295/6	0	03	60
	295/7	0	01	60
	295/8	0	02	80
	295/9	0	02	70
	295/10	0	00	50
	295/11	0	06	40
	337/4	0	01	30
	337/5	0	05	94
	337/6	0	00	70
	337/7	0	04	44
	337/8	0	08	14
	337/9	0	01	45
	337/10	0	00	30
	338/1	0	11	22
	338/4	0	00	60
	338/9	0	13	15
	338/11	0	04	00
	338/15	0	00	80
	341/1	0	11	22
	341/4	0	00	60
	342/1	0	03	80
	342/2	0	00	40
	342/3	0	04	80
	342/4	0	08	90
	348/2	0	00	10
	348/3	0	05	22
	348/4	0	03	00
	348/5	0	00	60
	348/6	0	02	43
	349/1	0	06	00
	349/2	0	04	00
	349/4	0	09	90
	349/5	0	00	10
	356	0	02	40

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	357/13	0	00	40
	357/14	0	01	06
	357/15	0	00	10
	357/17	0	09	90
	357/18	0	00	45
	357/19	0	00	90
	358	0	05	93
	359/2	0	02	27
	359/3	0	07	56
	359/5	0	05	22
	359/6	0	00	28
	359/10	0	03	20
	360/6	0	06	03
	360/2	0	03	65
	360/3	0	02	60
	360/5	0	05	90
	360/7	0	00	35
	369/3	0	00	65
	369/4	0	05	22
	369/6	0	01	44
	369/7	0	00	40
	369/9	0	03	84
	293/8	0	02	00
	293/10	0	04	00
	339/1	0	02	00
	339/3	0	01	00
	339/4	0	00	80
	347/6	0	01	00
	347/7	0	00	80
	350/5	0	00	85
	350/6	0	00	75
	350/10	0	00	95
	363	0	00	95
	362/1	0	02	00
	362/2	0	02	06
	362/3	0	01	00
	336/7	0	02	00
	336/8	0	04	00
	352/6	0	01	00
	352/7	0	04	00
कोजालमन्तम - I (खण्ड सं0 - 16)	565/0	0	02	00
	566/1	0	02	25
	566/5	0	01	00
	566/6	0	02	00
	566/8	0	01	00
	566/9	0	00	50
	566/10	0	10	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	566/11	0	01	05
	566/12	0	01	00
	566/13	0	00	98
	566/14	0	00	90
	566/18	0	02	50
	566/19	0	03	00
	563/1	0	08	00
	563/3	0	03	00
	563/5	0	01	00
	417/1	0	08	80
	417/2	0	38	00
	417/5	0	32	00
	417/6	0	04	50
	417/7	0	00	85
	422/1	0	00	50
	422/2	0	02	00
	422/3	0	04	00
	424/1	0	00	90
	424/2	0	01	40
	424/3	0	03	00
	425/8	0	08	00
	425/11	0	03	00
	425/12	0	02	00
	425/13	0	01	28
	425/18	0	00	80
	429/2	0	02	00
	429/15	0	00	80
	430/1	0	08	75
	430/2	0	20	10
	430/3	0	10	15
	430/5	0	08	10
	430/6	0	00	95
	430/7	0	01	00
	430/9	0	01	10
	431	0	08	10
	179/1	0	23	00
	181/1	0	00	88
	181/2	0	02	10
	181/4	0	00	70
	182/5	0	01	00
	182/7	0	02	00
	180/1	0	01	00
	180/3	0	08	00
	180/4	0	00	90
	180/5	0	00	98
	180/12	0	04	00
	183/1	0	00	98
	183/2	0	01	28
	183/3	0	01	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	183/4	0	00	40
	183/5	0	03	70
	183/6	0	01	00
	183/8	0	00	30
	183/9	0	01	00
	147/7	0	00	60
	148/2	0	00	60
	148/3	0	00	65
	148/4	0	05	65
	148/5	0	06	00
	148/8	0	00	80
	148/9	0	01	70
	148/13	0	00	78
	148/14	0	00	98
	150/1	0	01	00
	150/3	0	00	80
	150/5	0	00	40
	150/6	0	03	00
	150/8	0	02	50
	170/6	0	01	00
	170/7	0	01	05
	170/8	0	00	80
	170/9	0	00	60
	170/12	0	00	70
	170/13	0	02	00
	171/3	0	00	70
	171/10	0	02	00
	172/1	0	00	30
	171/3	0	01	00
	171/4	0	00	80
	171/12	0	00	85
	171/13	0	01	80
	171/15	0	00	40
	173/3	0	00	80
	173/6	0	08	15
	173/7	0	10	00
	416/1	0	03	10
	416/2	0	06	00
	416/3	0	04	00
	416/5	0	00	80
	416/6	0	00	40
	416/21	0	04	00
	570/1	0	00	68
	570/2	0	03	00
	570/3	0	01	75
	571/1	0	04	10
	571/3	0	02	25
	550	0	03	00
	549	0	03	75

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	426/6	0	01	18
	569	0	02	00
	187	0	15	00
कोजालमन्म - II (खण्ड सं० - 17)	136/6	0	00	80
	136/7	0	13	80
	137/5	0	03	15
	137/7	0	01	15
	137/8	0	02	08
	137/9	0	09	15
	138/1	0	00	90
	138/2	0	02	18
	138/3	0	08	25
	138/4	0	10	28
	139/2	0	02	10
	139/3	0	11	82
	139/4	0	08	77
	139/5	0	00	98
	139/6	0	00	30
	139/11	0	05	78
	139/12	0	03	25
	139/13	0	01	00
	140/4	0	01	80
	140/5	0	11	17
	140/6	0	11	50
	140/7	0	08	50
	140/8	0	01	20
	141/6	0	01	00
	141/7	0	10	00
	151/3	0	00	98
	151/4	0	01	00
	152/1	0	00	88
	152/2	0	25	50
	152/3	0	00	65
	153/4	0	01	25
	153/5	0	02	10
	155/6	0	02	10
	155/8	0	04	20
	155/9	0	08	18
	156/5	0	02	10
	156/6	0	04	10
	156/7	0	03	20
	156/8	0	05	75
	157/1	0	03	00
	157/2	0	02	08
	157/3	0	08	10
	157/4	0	03	05
	157/5	0	02	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	157/7	0	00	95
	157/8	0	00	60
	157/12	0	01	00
	158/1	0	03	18
	158/2	0	00	80
	159/3	0	00	20
	159/4	0	01	30
	159/5	0	02	15
	159/6	0	01	40
	159/7	0	02	00
	159/8	0	05	18
	159/9	0	00	80
	160/1	0	00	90
	160/2	0	06	35
	160/3	0	18	55
	160/5	0	03	50
	160/6	0	02	50
	160/7	0	01	75
	160/8	0	00	98
	161/1	0	01	15
	161/2	0	02	00
	167/1	0	02	05
	167/2	0	01	18
	179/1	0	03	15
	179/2	0	02	80
	179/3	0	01	98
	179/4	0	02	00
	179/5	0	00	95
	179/6	0	01	40
	179/11	0	00	88
	186/1	0	00	80
	186/11	0	00	70
	187/3	0	00	80
	187/4	0	02	70
	187/5	0	12	50
	187/6	0	00	70
	187/7	0	03	00
	187/8	0	04	37
	187/9	0	10	45
	188/9	0	01	00
	188/7	0	00	80
	188/10	0	11	00
	189/9	0	03	00
	191	0	01	00
	192/1	0	00	98
	192/2	0	01	00
	192/3	0	03	00
	192/4	0	10	00
	192/5	0	02	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	192/6	0	02	05
	192/7	0	02	50
	192/12	0	01	00
	192/13	0	00	25
	192/14	0	01	10
	193/1	0	00	98
	194	0	01	10
	285/1	0	01	15
	185/2	0	00	95
	185/3	0	00	80
	186/1	0	04	00
	287/1	0	02	00
	287/2	0	10	80
	287/3	0	11	25
	287/4	0	11	88
	287/5	0	00	95
	390/1	0	03	15
	390/2	0	00	80
	391/1	0	10	00
	391/2	0	03	00
	391/3	0	01	00
	391/4	0	02	00
कोजालमन्म - II (खण्ड सं० - 15)	382	0	00	35
	383/2	0	01	62
	383/3	0	08	48
	383/4	0	07	20
	383/5A	0	00	10
	383/5B	0	00	65
	383/5C	0	00	10
	383/5D	0	05	49
	383/5E	0	03	40
	384/1	0	11	43
	391/1	0	15	30
	392/1	0	08	20
	392/2	0	06	12
	392/3	0	04	63
	392/4	0	00	50
	392/6	0	01	71
	393/2	0	01	00
	393/3	0	06	00
	393/4	0	00	15
	393/5	0	01	95
	393/6A	0	05	60
	393/7	0	03	91
	393/8	0	02	73
	393/10	0	00	53
	408/2	0	06	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	409/1	0	07	56
	409/2	0	05	40
	409/3	0	00	15
	409/4	0	16	40
	409/11	0	00	50
	410/6	0	01	30
	410/7	0	06	40
	394/4	0	03	00
	394/6	0	02	00
	386/1	0	03	00
	386/9	0	02	00
	386/10	0	01	00
	386/5	0	03	00
	386/1C	0	04	00
	390/1	0	01	05
	390/2	0	01	24
तेन्कुरिशी - I (खण्ड सं0 - 18)	9/1	0	01	99
	9/2	0	08	18
	9/3	0	01	28
	8/6	0	14	08
	8/7	0	01	65
	8/11	0	04	86
	8/9	0	03	40
	8/10	0	09	89
	7/3	0	11	41
	7/4	0	06	25
	7/6	0	00	43
	7/9	0	01	00
	26/3	0	01	02
	27/1	0	02	00
	27/3	0	02	03
	27/6	0	02	06
	29/1	0	02	01
	29/2	0	03	00
	30/2	0	01	07
	30/3	0	13	59
	30/5	0	05	93
	30/6	0	05	90
	31	0	02	00
	33/2	0	00	98
	33//3	0	06	90
	33/5	0	08	64
	33/6	0	04	12
	34/2	0	06	29
	34/3	0	08	07
	34/4	0	01	45
	34/5	0	03	35

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	34/7	0	04	93
	35/1	0	02	00
	35/2	0	01	00
	36/1	0	07	70
	36/2	0	19	77
	36/3	0	05	58
	36/8	0	00	63
	38/4	0	02	67
	38/5	0	02	33
	38/7	0	01	58
	38/9	0	06	88
	38/10	0	12	66
	39/6	0	01	00
	39/7	0	01	00
	39/8	0	02	00
	39/13	0	03	00
	41/3	0	01	00
	41/8	0	01	04
	41/9	0	06	25
	43/1	0	07	82
	43/5	0	07	13
	43/7	0	05	15
	43/9	0	03	83
	42/1	0	06	27
	42/3	0	08	83
	42/5	0	05	58
	42/6	0	10	81
	55/1	0	01	00
	55/2	0	01	65
	55/18	0	03	00
	415/4	0	02	00
	415/7	0	02	05
	415/8	0	03	04
	415/12	0	04	02
	415/13	0	03	00
	418/5	0	01	00
	418/10	0	00	80
	418/17	0	00	60
	418/18	0	00	50
	418/21	0	00	90
	420/7	0	00	65
	420/9	0	00	76
	420/13	0	00	60
	420/14	0	00	70
	420/15	0	02	00
	422/1	0	01	60
	422/2	0	02	05
	422/3	0	00	80
	422/13	0	00	75

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	425/1	0	02	00
	425/2	0	01	60
	425/3	0	03	00
	425/4	0	00	75
	425/17	0	00	90
	427	0	01	02
	413/1	0	04	10
	413/2	0	07	40
	413/3	0	01	00
	413/5	0	05	60
	413/6	0	04	00
	414/1	0	13	40
	414/3	0	07	95
	414/4	0	02	16
	414/5	0	04	25
	414/8	0	04	00
	421/1	0	29	95
	421/2	0	04	85
	421/3	0	01	30
	421/8	0	23	10
	427	0	01	00
	428	0	08	00
	431/1	0	00	95
	431/2	0	08	00
	431/5	0	05	92
	431/6	0	11	11
	431/7	0	00	80
	4	0	02	50
	432	0	01	00

तालुका - पालाकाड

कन्नाडी - I (खण्ड सं0 - 51)	373/3	0	07	25
	373/4	0	00	25
	373/5	0	03	54
	373/6	0	05	61
	376/1	0	05	35
	376/2	0	02	73
	376/4	0	13	17
	379/3	0	01	45
	379/4	0	07	29
	379/5	0	07	47
	379/6	0	08	60
	381/4	0	14	84
	381/5	0	01	31
	381/6	0	03	89
	381/7	0	03	35
	381/8	0	00	30
	381/10	0	01	62
	381/11	0	02	43

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	381/13	0	02	02
	381/14	0	04	35
	382/1	0	04	69
	382/3	0	00	60
	382/7	0	00	50
	383/2	0	05	32
	383/3	0	00	90
	383/6	0	01	80
	384	0	05	49
	385/1	0	08	90
	394/1	0	02	60
	394/2	0	03	42
	394/3	0	08	15
	397/3	0	00	54
	397/4	0	04	40
	397/5	0	07	88
	397/6	0	09	90
	398/14	0	03	24
	401	0	15	40
	402	0	20	40
	403/3	0	04	99
	403/5	0	01	89
	427/9	0	01	15
	427/10	0	00	50
	427/11	0	01	18
	427/12	0	02	00
	427/13	0	02	40
	427/14	0	07	00
	428/5	0	05	25
	428/6	0	08	09
	428/7	0	00	30
	428/15	0	02	76
	428/16	0	00	38
	428/17	0	10	80
	433/18	0	00	65
	433/1	0	06	00
	433/2	0	01	00
	433/7	0	00	85
	433/8	0	00	68
	434/3	0	04	90
	435/1	0	14	00
	436/2	0	21	50
	380/1	0	03	00
	375/2	0	01	00
	375/3	0	06	45
	375/4	0	01	50
	375/5	0	01	00
	375/6	0	02	10
	374/7	0	01	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	374/15	0	02	55
	400/4	0	00	99
	400/10	0	01	00
	395	0	08	10
	429/1	0	04	00
	429/7	0	02	00
	429/8	0	03	15
	429/9	0	01	40
	429/12	0	00	40
	429/13	0	01	25
	437/11	0	00	80
	437/12	0	01	00
	437/14	0	01	80
कन्नाडी - I (खण्ड सं0 - 50)	191/0	0	02	20
	196/1	0	02	36
	196/2	0	02	98
	196/3	0	02	63
	196/4	0	03	24
	196/5	0	00	90
	199/8	0	06	07
	199/9	0	02	34
	199/14	0	03	60
	200/18	0	00	90
	200/20	0	01	15
	200/21	0	01	34
	207/3	0	03	45
	207/4	0	02	43
	207/15	0	03	46
	207/16	0	02	22
	208/1	0	01	21
	208/2	0	06	07
	208/3	0	04	15
	208/8	0	01	23
	209/1	0	01	90
	209/2	0	01	45
	209/3	0	03	24
	209/5	0	03	00
	209/6	0	14	18
	211/1	0	01	50
	211/2	0	02	17
	211/3	0	01	18
	211/4	0	01	35
	211/7	0	01	36
	211/11	0	04	16
	224/2	0	01	21
	224/3	0	04	25

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	224/4	0	10	12
	224/15	0	01	37
	224/5	0	03	24
	224/6	0	04	18
	224/7	0	01	90
	224/16	0	02	43
	224/11	0	03	24
	224/12	0	08	09
	224/13	0	01	21
	224/10	0	01	82
	225/12	0	05	64
	225/13	0	06	07
	225/24	0	03	19
	226/1	0	00	30
	226/2	0	04	15
	226/3	0	04	45
	226/4	0	08	90
	227/4	0	01	14
	227/5	0	00	90
	227/6	0	00	30
	227/7	0	14	40
	228/1	0	20	24
	228/2	0	00	80
	228/3	0	06	14
	228/6	0	03	09
	228/7	0	01	08
	228/8	0	00	80
	229/1	0	04	08
	241	0	03	90
	242/2	0	02	08
	242/3	0	08	37
	242/4	0	13	25
	242/6	0	03	24
	242/7	0	01	00
	194/2	0	02	10
	194/3	0	02	21
	194/4	0	05	14
	194/5	0	03	18
	194/6	0	02	90
	197/5	0	01	13
	197/6	0	08	00
	197/7	0	01	30
	197/8	0	03	21
	197/9	0	03	14
	197/12	0	12	00
	197/13	0	02	00
	210/1	0	09	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	210/2	0	11	27
	210/3	0	05	31
	210/5	0	03	14
	210/6	0	01	21
	210/8	0	01	37
	212/2	0	01	31
	212/3	0	01	27
	212/4	0	08	10
	212/5	0	03	37
	212/6	0	01	21
	212/7	0	04	05
	212/8	0	03	10
	212/9	0	04	05
	212/10	0	06	07
	212/11	0	04	10
	212/12	0	02	05
	212/19	0	02	09
कन्नडाडी - II (खण्ड सं० - 50)	297/1	0	24	30
	297/2	0	18	65
	297/3	0	05	90
	297/4	0	08	49
	298/1	0	04	10
	298/2	0	05	15
	299/3	0	06	49
	299/2	0	00	20
	299/4	0	03	24
	299/5	0	12	14
	299/6	0	02	43
	299/7	0	00	80
	299/8	0	01	90
	299/9	0	01	08
	299/10	0	04	82
	299/11	0	01	93
	299/16	0	04	00
	300/5	0	03	98
	300/6	0	08	10
	300/7	0	02	10
	300/12	0	00	90
	303	0	02	63
	304/8	0	03	09
	304/9	0	02	14
	305/2	0	02	08
	305/3	0	05	00
	305/4	0	08	10
	305/5	0	04	49
	305/16	0	07	14
	305/6	0	01	19
	305/9	0	04	18

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	309/1	0	02	23
	309/4	0	01	16
	309/2	0	03	24
	309/3	0	03	10
	309/5	0	01	80
	308	0	04	18
	419/1	0	03	24
	427/1	0	03	23
	427/2	0	07	18
	427/3	0	10	20
	427/4	0	03	04
	428/7	0	06	07
	428/9	0	02	43
	428/10	0	01	82
	428/11	0	38	10
	483/6	0	09	20
	483/7	0	04	90
	483/5	0	01	00
	483/8	0	06	14
	486	0	02	13
	487/15	0	08	10
	487/16	0	06	09
	487/17	0	01	90
	487/18	0	03	10
	488/1	0	00	84
	488/2	0	10	12
	488/4	0	04	10
	488/5	0	01	09
	488/9	0	01	08
	489	0	10	12
	490	0	01	43
	506/1	0	02	20
	506/2	0	16	19
	506/3	0	06	08
	506/4	0	01	08
	506/10	0	01	21
	507/2	0	12	14
	507/4	0	08	09
	507/3	0	07	00
	507/10	0	01	13
	507/5	0	02	43
	508/13	0	08	09
	508/14	0	02	63
	519/1	0	05	17
	520/2	0	01	90
	520/6	0	06	07
	520/7	0	04	09
	521/5	0	02	10
	521/6	0	00	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	521/7	0	03	00
	521/8	0	13	00
	522/1	0	01	10
	522/2	0	02	05
	522/3	0	01	08
	522/4	0	01	10
	522/6	0	12	19
	522/7	0	11	27
	522/8	0	09	90
	523/14	0	04	43
	523/17	0	01	00
	524	0	04	43
	525	0	03	90
	528/1	0	01	10
	528/3	0	03	24
	528/4	0	01	90
	528/5	0	10	00
	528/6	0	10	12
	528/9	0	03	29
	528/10	0	03	98
	290/2	0	22	00
	290/4	0	02	00
	290/5	0	08	10
	290/6	0	04	20
	292	0	02	80
	413/1	0	14	20
	413/2	0	12	40
	413/3	0	05	80
	420/1	0	02	00
	420/2	0	03	20
	421/1	0	07	00
	421/5	0	03	20
	421/7	0	03	60
	421/8	0	00	90
	421/10	0	01	30
	421/11	0	07	80
	421/12	0	01	50
	422/8	0	05	40
	422/9	0	01	00
	422/16	0	00	20
	425/7	0	08	80
	425/8	0	00	80
	425/9	0	12	40
	425/10	0	07	80
	426/10	0	01	00
	426/11	0	08	40
	426/12	0	07	80
	426/13	0	08	20

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कोडुम्प	112	0	22	00
(खण्ड सं० - 46)	172	0	03	60
	173/6	0	10	62
	173/8	0	01	43
	173/9	0	02	02
	173/19	0	00	30
	173/10	0	01	60
	173/14	0	01	10
	173/13	0	00	60
	173/12	0	00	95
	174/1	0	01	43
	174/5	0	06	07
	174/8	0	01	90
	174/4	0	02	90
	186/10	0	01	21
	186/11	0	04	86
	186/12	0	01	30
	187/2	0	03	30
	187/3	0	06	70
	187/4	0	00	90
	207/2	0	27	00
	210/1	0	04	14
	210/2	0	31	50
	210/3	0	01	10
	209/2	0	04	70
	209/3	0	01	62
	209/4	0	01	10
	209/6	0	08	09
	211/1	0	10	12
	211/8	0	01	62
	215/4	0	28	10
	215/5	0	00	21
	215/6	0	00	10
	215/9	0	01	25
	216/4	0	07	17
	216/5	0	03	82
	217/1	0	00	40
	217/2	0	00	30
	217/3	0	00	30
	217/4	0	03	96
	217/5	0	05	10
	217/6	0	00	80
	217/7	0	01	90
	217/8	0	03	24
	217/9	0	09	36
	206/3	0	32	60
	206/4	0	04	80
	206/5	0	02	97
	208	0	02	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	397/1	0	00	80
	397/3	0	06	20
	397/5	0	06	40
	397/9	0	04	80
	398/1	0	15	80
	398/2	0	12	20
	401/3	0	02	12
	401/6	0	21	60
	402/10	0	10	80
	402/18	0	01	30
	402/20	0	01	05
	402/21	0	00	41
	402/26	0	00	30
	402/27	0	05	40
	614/2	0	04	82
	615/2	0	01	62
	615/3	0	02	40
	615/6	0	10	12
	615/7	0	09	00
	615/8	0	05	64
	615/9	0	06	82
	619/1,4	0	19	22
	617/8	0	10	80
	618/1	0	24	00
	618/2	0	00	80
	616/1	0	09	90
	616/3	0	01	18
	622/1	0	08	64
	623/3	0	12	24
	623/6	0	08	46
	624/5	0	02	43
	624/6	0	05	64
	624/7	0	05	90
	657	0	05	40
	658/1	0	02	90
	658/4	0	01	41
	658/5	0	09	90
	659/1	0	01	08
	659/3	0	02	43
	659/4	0	00	40
	659/8	0	02	25
	659/9	0	09	90
	659/10	0	00	80
	660/1	0	01	00
	660/3	0	14	10
	660/7	0	03	10
	660/8	0	00	10
	660/6	0	00	20
	680/6	0	03	15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	680/7	0	09	80
	681/4	0	02	00
	681/5	0	06	98
	681/6	0	05	14
	681/11	0	05	18
	682/1	0	19	44
	682/2	0	01	62
	682/3	0	02	02
	682/4	0	03	00
	682/5	0	01	00
	682/7	0	01	10
	682/8	0	11	34
	683/1	0	02	10
	683/2	0	04	40
	683/3	0	04	60
	683/4	0	00	80
	683/10	0	02	90
	684/1	0	02	16
	684/2	0	18	14
	684/3	0	02	15
	684/11	0	20	24
	685/1	0	05	00
	685/2	0	01	10
	685/3	0	08	80
	685/4	0	01	90
	685/5	0	08	00
	685/6	0	01	41
	685/7	0	02	10
	685/8	0	00	90
	685/9	0	01	42
	685/10	0	06	50
	686/1	0	03	00
	686/2	0	02	20
	686/9	0	02	43
	690/1	0	02	02
	690/2	0	05	14
	692	0	04	50
	693/1	0	08	00
	693/2	0	04	86
	693/4	0	02	23
	694	0	03	60
	695	0	04	00
	717/4	0	13	00
	717/5	0	02	43
	717/6	0	11	00
	717/8	0	00	80
	718/1	0	00	90
	718/2	0	04	00
	718/3	0	09	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	718/11	0	02	02
	719/1	0	02	40
	719/2	0	03	90
	719/3	0	06	47
	719/4	0	01	18
कोडुम्ब (खण्ड सं0 - 47)	9	0	40	00
	10/4	0	08	09
	11/7	0	01	10
	11/8	0	01	21
	38/2	0	03	24
	39/2	0	02	21
	39/4	0	02	43
	39/5	0	01	21
	40/1	0	02	63
	41/1	0	03	62
	42/1	0	06	07
	42/2	0	01	41
	43/1	0	03	18
	43/2	0	01	10
	43/3	0	06	07
	44/11	0	01	10
	44/12	0	01	21
	44/13	0	03	24
	45/2	0	01	30
	45/3	0	04	05
	45/4	0	01	90
	45/5	0	01	82
	46/5	0	01	10
	46/6	0	01	50
	47/1	0	01	18
	47/2	0	01	21
	48/1	0	01	50
	48/2	0	02	99
	48/3	0	01	17
	48/4	0	01	19
	105/2	0	21	00
	109/3	0	02	43
	109/4	0	10	12
	109/5	0	10	25
	109/6	0	03	19
	109/7	0	07	18
	109/8	0	10	12
	110/9	0	02	23
	110/12	0	02	43
	111/1	0	02	10
	111/2	0	04	05
	111/3	0	09	18

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	111/4	0	03	21
	111/6	0	00	41
	111/7	0	02	10
	113/1	0	04	05
	113/2	0	04	05
	113/3	0	06	07
	114/1	0	00	80
	114/9	0	05	07
	114/10	0	02	43
	114/12	0	28	00
	115/13	0	08	09
	115/15	0	01	10
	115/16	0	01	21
	115/17	0	04	05
	119/13	0	01	90
	120/1	0	02	43
	120/2	0	04	05
	120/8	0	04	10
	121/1	0	02	13
	121/4	0	01	50
	121/9	0	08	00
	121/10	0	02	43
	121/11	0	02	63
	122/1	0	00	38
	122/2	0	04	10
	122/3	0	01	43
	122/4	0	01	21
	122/5	0	02	12
	122/6	0	01	10
	122/7	0	01	90
	122/8	0	10	00
	123/2	0	08	09
	123/4	0	01	17
	123/5	0	05	14
	123/6	0	04	15
	123/7	0	01	21
	123/1	0	02	43
	123/11	0	01	21
	124/1	0	10	08
	124/2	0	02	00
	124/4	0	02	12
	124/5	0	02	21
	124/6	0	02	15
	124/7	0	01	17
मारुधारोड़ (खण्ड सं० - 38)	573/3	0	01	18
	573/4	0	02	21
	573/5	0	12	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	573/6	0	02	43
	573/8	0	01	08
	573/10	0	02	12
	573/12	0	04	43
	573/13	0	02	43
	575/3	0	01	21
	575/4	0	01	82
	575/5	0	02	45
	575/6	0	03	24
	575/7	0	04	86
	577/6	0	02	90
	577/7	0	03	90
	577/11	0	06	41
	577/12	0	02	43
	577/13	0	01	90
	577/14	0	01	28
	578/1	0	16	00
	578/2	0	11	00
	578/3	0	12	80
	578/4	0	01	82
	579/2	0	01	10
	579/3	0	01	21
	579/4	0	06	07
	579/5	0	03	24
	579/6	0	04	45
	585/1	0	05	64
	585/2	0	03	63
	585/3	0	04	10
	585/4	0	03	24
	585/5	0	01	18
	586/1	0	03	90
	586/2	0	03	60
	586/3	0	11	82
	586/4	0	01	90
	586/5	0	01	19
	586/6	0	03	24
	586/7	0	05	61
	587/3	0	01	62
	587/4	0	11	36
	587/5	0	01	64
	587/6	0	03	45
	587/7	0	10	12
	587/8	0	04	45
	587/9	0	01	82
	588/1	0	03	27
	588/4	0	02	66
	589/1	0	28	80
	589/2	0	01	62

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ऐलापिल्ली - II	6/8	0	02	10
(खण्ड सं० - 39)	6/9	0	03	98
	6/11	0	02	96
	7/1	0	08	09
	7/2	0	02	10
	8/2	0	03	10
	8/3	0	08	90
	9/6	0	01	60
	9/7	0	10	12
	9/8	0	03	24
	9/9	0	01	21
	11/1	0	02	00
	11/2	0	04	20
	11/3	0	02	18
	11/7	0	04	05
	11/8	0	02	96
	11/9	0	06	07
	11/10	0	04	18
	11/11	0	04	05
	11/12	0	01	00
	11/13	0	01	10
	12/1	0	04	05
	16/1	0	09	15
	16/2	0	25	10
	16/3	0	04	05
	17/8	0	02	02
	17/10	0	03	24
	17/11	0	04	40
	18/1	0	01	08
	18/2	0	03	10
	18/3	0	02	02
	18/4	0	07	18
	18/5	0	11	27
	18/6	0	00	30
	18/8	0	10	12
	19/4	0	04	05
	19/5	0	03	45
	19/7	0	04	15
	20/1	0	01	00
	20/2	0	22	00
	20/3	0	04	10
	20/4	0	02	02
	20/5	0	01	00
	21/1	0	02	10
	21/2	0	01	18
	21/3	0	01	10
	57	0	02	10
	58/1	00	12	14

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	58/3	0	02	30
	63/1	0	22	00
	63/2	0	18	00
	64/1	0	04	05
	64/2	0	01	18
	65	0	04	10
	66	0	03	19
	67/1	0	08	09
	67/2	0	06	15
	67/4	0	01	39
	68/1	0	02	10
	68/8	0	03	64
	69/1	0	08	09
	69/2	0	02	02
	69/4	0	04	15
	69/5	0	07	00
	70	0	01	41
	71	0	00	90
	85/1	0	06	09
	85/2	0	02	12
	85/12	0	01	90
	85/13	0	00	35
	87/1	0	06	00
	87/2	0	08	09
	87/3	0	02	18
	87/5	0	01	00
	88/3	0	02	10
	88/4	0	08	10
	88/5	0	10	06
	88/6	0	01	80
	91/4	0	04	10
	91/7	0	02	30
	91/8	0	02	60
	91/9	0	09	80
	91/10	0	06	10
	91/11	0	07	18
	91/12	0	02	40
	91/13	0	03	40
	92/1	0	03	00
	92/2	0	02	10
	92/3	0	03	20
	92/4	0	01	18
	92/5	0	01	40
	92/6	0	01	90
	92/16	0	02	43
	93/1	0	88	00
	93/2	0	03	60
	93/3	0	09	90
	93/6	0	03	71

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	94/0	0	29	00
	102/3	0	01	01
	102/4	0	01	09
	102/5	0	02	10
	102/6	0	04	86
	132/6	0	02	20
	137/7	0	18	00
	137/1	0	00	60
	138/1	0	08	09
	138/2	0	01	50
	138/3	0	05	14
	138/6	0	07	00
	139/1	0	06	07
	139/2	0	04	10
	139/3	0	01	09
	139/4	0	02	21
	139/5	0	02	10
	142/4	0	02	21
	142/5	0	06	08
	142/6	0	08	09
	142/7	0	06	07
	142/8	0	06	09
	142/9	0	01	50
	142/11	0	03	24
	142/12	0	00	50
	142/13	0	01	00
	144/1	0	03	10
	144/2	0	06	07
	144/7	0	01	06
	144/8	0	08	18
	144/9	0	01	07
	148/1/1	0	06	09
	149/11	0	01	09
	149/12	0	17	00
	149/14	0	04	09
	149/15	0	02	60
	149/13	0	01	00
	150/1	0	00	50
	150/5	0	17	00
	150/6	0	01	80
	150/7	0	04	60
	150/10	0	11	00
	150/14	0	05	10
	150/16	0	06	07
	163/8	0	03	10
	164/1/1	0	08	10
	164/2/2	0	03	10
	164/2/1	0	01	90
	164/2/2	0	01	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	164/2/3	0	06	09
	164/2/4	0	03	14
	165/1	0	03	50
	165/2	0	06	50
	166/1	0	15	00
	166/2	0	02	20
	166/3	0	05	50
	475/1	0	05	14
	475/3	0	18	14
	475/4	0	12	20
	476/4	1	00	20
	476/5	0	04	05
	476/6	0	02	02
	476/7	0	01	10
	478/4	0	22	00
	478/5	0	20	00
	478/6	0	01	17
	479/2	0	04	10
	479/3	0	06	07
	480/3	0	02	19
	480/4	0	28	09
	480/5	0	18	10
	481/1	0	18	20
	481/2	0	08	00
	481/7	0	06	07
	481/3	0		90
	481/8	0	02	02
	484/1	0	15	60
	484/3	0	02	15
ऐलापिल्ली - II (खण्ड सं0 - 40)	40/10	0	10	12
	41/2	0	08	64
	41/1	0	01	05
	41/4	0	07	20
	41/5	0	06	12
	42/5	0	05	40
	42/6	0	00	40
	42/7	0	09	29
	42/8	0	01	08
	42/9	0	01	09
	42/10	0	12	96
	42/11	0	00	80
	42/3	0	01	10
	43	0	02	63
	44	0	01	15
	49/1	0	02	82
	49/2	0	18	00
	49/3	0	05	64

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	53/1	0	03	49
	53/2	0	01	20
	53/4	0	03	26
	54/1	0	00	21
	54/2	0	00	15
	54/3	0	00	10
	54/4	0	00	90
	54/5	0	06	07
	54/6	0	01	45
	55/1	0	01	09
	55/2	0	03	90
	55/3	0	06	07
	55/4	0	19	80
	55/5	0	13	68
	56/4	0	10	00
	56/10	0	10	00
	57/5	0	09	10
	57/6	0	03	82
	57/9	0	06	30
	58/5	0	12	24
	101/1	0	01	10
	101/5	0	05	76
	101/8	0	25	74
	101/9	0	01	01
	101/10	0	01	82
	101/11	0	02	90
	101/12	0	00	59
	101/6	0	01	15
	101/7	0	01	25
	102/5	0	22	10
	102/2	0	02	10
	102/7	0	13	00
	102/3	0	01	10
	102/8	0	01	00
	102/4	0	01	12
	102/9	0	03	09
	120	0	15	00
	121/1	0	03	90
	121/2	0	02	10
	121/3	0	00	42
	121/4	0	01	18
	121/6	0	15	00
	121/7	0	01	05
	121/10	0	00	90
	121/11	0	00	30
	121/12	0	00	98
	121/13	0	00	15
	121/9	0	01	15
	121/14	0	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	122/11	0	09	25
	123	0	29	70
	131	0	20	00
	132	0	22	00
	133/3	0	03	24
	133/4	0	00	40
	133/5	0	01	02
	133/6	0	05	28
	133/7	0	00	60
	134/2	0	01	08
	134/1	0	10	00
	134/4	0	13	50
	134/5	0	06	07
	134/6	0	04	68
	134/7	0	08	64
	135/1	0	02	98
	135/2	0	00	90
	135/4	0	02	02
	135/5	0	10	12
	151/1	0	01	05
	151/4	0	00	80
	151/3	0	01	02
	151/5	0	01	26
	151/6	0	10	80
	151/7	0	04	08
	151/8	0	01	98
	167/4	0	12	60
	167/5	0	01	98
	167/6	0	00	92
	167/10	0	23	40
	167/7	0	00	50
	167/8	0	00	41
	167/9	0	00	52
	168/2	0	08	90
	168/6	0	01	12
	168/4	0	11	70
	168/5	0	02	05
	169/6	0	00	80
	169/7	0	08	55
	169/8	0	00	90
	169/9	0	07	18
	87/6	0	01	12
	99/3	0	04	00
	99/9	0	01	15
	99/12	0	01	20
	99/7	0	00	40
	100/4	0	05	02
	152/7	0	01	15
	152/8	0	00	95

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	152/9	0	01	10
	173/2	0	06	78
ऐलापिहरी - I	150/1	0	17	00
(खण्ड सं० - 40)	150/2	0	04	10
	177	0	14	76
	178/3	0	00	90
	178/6	0	04	32
	178/8	0	01	01
	178/9	0	02	08
	178/10	0	10	80
	179/5	0	01	10
	179/6	0	04	32
	179/7	0	04	50
	179/8	0	01	62
	180/5	0	12	60
	183/1	0	05	40
	183/2	0	06	09
	183/3	0	00	22
	182/1	0	07	92
	182/3	0	05	76
	182/4	0	05	40
	182/5	0	05	04
	181/2	0	00	90
	181/5	0	02	02
	181/8	0	00	90
	181/9	0	00	05
	181/10	0	00	30
पुद्गेशोरी (पश्चिमी)	539/8	0	10	80
(खण्ड सं० - 36)	539/9	0	02	60
	539/10	0	00	90
	539/11	0	01	21
	540/1	0	01	10
	540/8	0	08	64
	540/10	0	03	96
	540/18	0	01	21
	540/19	0	12	60
	542	0	04	86
	543/10	0	01	21
	543/11	0	05	25
	543/12	0	06	17
	547/2	0	25	00
	548/1	0	26	10
	548/2	0	00	90
	548/3	0	01	82

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	552/1	0	05	14
	552/2	0	06	07
	552/3	0	01	10
	552/4	0	01	43
पुडूशेरी (मध्यम)				
(खण्ड सं० - 34)				
	480/2	0	08	20
	483/4	0	00	60
	484/2	0	26	80
	484/3	0	03	60
	484/4	0	01	00
	484/5	0	22	40
	484/6	0	02	20
	486/2	0	01	40
	486/4	0	06	50
	546/2	0	49	60
	547/2	0	01	20
	560/1	0	01	40
	560/2	0	27	00
	560/4	0	00	60
	561/2	0	01	40
	561/3	0	02	80
	561/4	0	01	60
	566/7	0	09	00
	567/1	0	02	00
	567/4	0	00	60
	568/3	0	39	20
	568/4	0	18	00
	570/3	0	01	80
	570/6	0	00	60
	571	0	03	60
	575/1	0	19	40
	575/2	0	01	40
	575/7	0	07	20
	575/5	0	00	50
	575/8	0	01	40
	575/9	0	00	30
	576/1	0	21	20
	577/1	0	19	80
	577/2	0	04	10
	578/2	0	01	30
	589/0	0	18	00
	485/1	0	01	80
	485/2	0	07	80
	485/3	0	03	90
	485/6	0	09	20
	487/1	0	07	20
	487/2	0	07	00
	487/3	0	06	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	488/1	0	14	00
	490/1	0	01	00
	545/1	0	01	80
	545/2	0	06	20
	588	0	04	00
	598/0	0	02	20
पुद्दुशेरी (पूर्व) (खण्ड सं० - 33)	158/3	0	01	40
	158/17	0	05	80
	158/16	0	01	20
	158/7	0	06	07
	158/8	0	03	20
	159/2	0	01	60
	159/8	0	19	20
	159/9	0	08	80
	159/10	0	04	80
	192	0	01	80
	190/5	0	02	10
	190/6	0	31	20
	190/8	0	08	09
	189/4	0	09	20
	188/1	0	03	10
	188/3	0	05	20
	188/4	0	06	07
	187	0	39	00
	180/4	0	11	80
	180/5	0	04	00
	180/6	0	00	10
	181/8	0	00	25
	181/14	0	01	00
	210/3	0	07	20
	210/4	0	01	00
	209	0	06	12
	213/1	0	14	10
	213/2	0	02	20
	213/4	0	06	12
	212/1	0	01	60
	212/3	0	28	10
	212/4	0	02	00
	215/1	0	01	10
	215/6	0	04	00
	215/7	0	06	50
	215/8	0	02	00
	215/9	0	01	10
	215/11	0	02	71
	216/1	0	08	00
	216/3	0	01	62
	229/2	0	04	60

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	229/3	0	05	14
	230/1	0	03	15
	230/3	0	05	00
	230/4	0	03	15
	230/8	0	05	00
	228/1	0	06	10
	228/12	0	05	00
	228/13	0	06	14
	228/9	0	07	00
	228/16	0	07	60
	226/0	0	34	00
	223/2	0	05	14
	223/3	0	15	20
	225/2	0	26	00
	225/1	0	08	09
	224	0	09	00

[फा. सं. आर. 31015/12/98-ओ आर-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, 6th September, 1999

S. O. 2548.— Whereas it appears to the central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of Motor Spirit, Superior Kerosene Oil and High Speed Diesel from Irimpanam Installaion of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Irimpanam, Cochin in the State of Kerala to Karur in the State of Tamil Nadu, a pipeline should be laid by Petronet C.C.K. Limited;

And, whereas, for the purpose of laying such pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the lands described in the schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, In exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government hereby declares Its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in lands described in the said schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Sri. A.T. James, competent authority (Kerala), Cochin-Coimbatore-Karur Pipeline Project, Golden Plaza Annexe, Chittoor Road, Cochin - 18, Kerala State, Pin - 682 018.

SCHEDULE**STATE: KERALA****DISTRICT : PALAKKAD****TALUK: ALATHUR**

VILLAGE	SURVEY NUMBERS	AREA (APPROX.)		
		HECTARES	ARES	SQ.MTRS.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
KANNAMBRA-II (BLOCK NO. 34)	607/11	0	40	45
	658/3	0	00	15
	658/1	0	03	10
	658/2	0	03	10
	658/11	0	03	20
	658/5	0	02	90
	660/4	0	01	18
	660/2	0	04	15
	661/1	0	01	37
	661/2	0	03	27
	661/3	0	18	60
	661/5	0	02	43
	662/1	0	07	21
	662/2	0	06	07
	662/3	0	03	00
	662/4	0	01	00
	662/5	0	12	20
	663/4	0	04	05
	663/5	0	02	02
	664/5	0	01	09
	664/8	0	01	08
	664/6	0	01	09
	664/7	0	01	10
	665/1	0	03	20
	665/2	0	12	14
	665/5	0	08	09
	665/3	0	08	10
	665/4	0	09	80
	666/1	0	02	10
	666/5	0	03	90
	666/8	0	02	80
	666/9	0	02	00
	666/10	0	01	00
	667/4	0	05	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	667/5	0	03	00
	667/6	0	13	00
	176	0	02	00
	175/7	0	34	00
	175/8	0	09	00
	175/9	0	04	00
	174/7	0	11	80
VADAKKANCHERY-I				
(BLOCK NO.34)	668/1	0	10	00
	669/7	0	02	02
	669/5	0	04	05
	669/6	0	04	00
	669/2	0	04	07
	669/3	0	02	01
	669/10	0	00	40
	669/11	0	08	06
	670/5	0	11	00
	670/8	0	10	06
	670/9	0	09	50
	670/6	0	01	01
	671/6	0	13	00
	671/7	0	11	00
	671/5	0	01	00
	676	0	02	06
	677/2	0	18	00
	677/3	0	01	00
	677/4	0	14	00
	677/1	0	01	00
	678/1	0	00	80
	678/3	0	01	00
	679	0	00	60
	692/1	0	02	00
	692/8	0	01	50
KANNAMBRA-I				
(BLOCK NO. 36)	8/1	1	48	00
	8/8	0	01	00
	9/1	0	10	00
	10/1	0	03	00
	10/2	0	05	00
	10/11	0	28	00
	10/3	0	03	00
	12/4	0	01	12
	12/5	0	01	05
	12/7	0	05	00
	12/6	0	20	00
	12/1	1	40	00
	12/8	0	03	00
	12/9	0	01	00
	12/2	0	01	05
	13/1	0	05	00
	14/1	0	01	06
	14/2	0	01	14
	15/1	1	00	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	15/4	1	20	00
	15/2	0	01	00
	15/3A	0	01	05
	15/9	0	08	00
	36/1	0	18	00
	36/8	0	08	00
	36/5	0	03	00
	36/12	0	13	00
	36/13	0	07	07
	36/14	0	28	00
	36/3	0	12	00
	36/4	0	02	00
	36/16	0	01	00
	36/9	0	01	04
	39/2	0	18	00
	39/3	0	04	00
	39/7	0	01	05
	39/13	0	12	00
	39/12	0	12	50
	39/4	0	06	00
	39/5	0	03	00
	39/9	0	13	00
	39/8	0	12	00
	46/4	0	38	00
	46/5	0	01	00
	46/8	0	02	00
	47/2	0	10	00
	48/2	2	40	00
	48/1	0	01	00
	48/5	0	01	12
	49/1	0	00	90
	49/2	0	01	00
	49/12	0	01	00
	49/11	0	02	00
	49/3	0	01	00
	49/5	0	10	00
	49/10	0	01	00
	49/8	0	02	00
	50/1	0	02	00
	50/3	0	80	00
	50/2	0	28	00
	50/4	0	01	00
	50/5	0	04	00
	76/7	0	02	00
	76/2	0	03	00
	76/14	0	28	00
	76/6	0	02	00
	77/5	0	08	00
	78/1	0	20	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	78/6	0	28	00
	78/9	0	04	00
	78/10	0	01	00
	78/7	0	04	00
	78/12	0	01	00
	79	0	80	00
	80/1	0	15	00
	80/17	0	02	00
	80/2	0	01	00
	80/20	0	01	25
	80/3	0	01	30
	80/4	0	01	40
	80/5	0	02	32
	80/8	0	02	40
	80/6	0	01	20
	81/15	0	09	00
	81/18	0	02	00
	81/14	0	01	00
	81/19	0	09	00
	81/20	0	02	00
	81/3	0	14	00
	81/29	0	02	00
	81/23	0	05	00
	81/28	0	24	00
	81/26	0	01	00
	81/27	0	01	00
	81/32	0	08	25
	81/35	0	06	15
	81/36	0	04	00
	81/37	0	01	00
	81/38	0	01	00
	81/41	0	06	00
	81/39	0	02	00
	81/40	0	01	00
	81/42	0	11	00
	81/43	0	01	00
	81/44	0	12	00
	81/1	0	01	00
	82	0	20	00
	95/1	0	28	00
	95/2	0	06	00
	95/8	0	18	00
	95/9	0	04	00
	95/10	0	12	00
	95/11	0	24	00
	95/12	0	38	00
	95/3	0	04	00
	96/2	0	04	00
	96/1	0	04	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	103/3	0	06	66
	103/4	0	01	00
	103/7	0	01	21
	103/8	0	00	60
	104/9	0	28	76
	104/2	0	21	60
	104/4	0	01	00
	104/5	0	02	02
	105/2	0	40	47
	107/1	0	02	00
	107/2	0	44	10
	107/5	0	02	00
	108/5	0	10	26
	108/2	0	11	70
	108/6	0	08	10
	108/1	0	02	10
	109/2	0	02	00
	109/3	0	08	10
	109/4	0	03	84
	109/7	0	03	00
	109/5	0	09	90
	110/4	0	01	00
	110/2	0	12	60
	110/3	0	03	24
	110/9	0	02	00
	110/5	0	07	92
	110/7	0	00	72
	110/10	0	02	02
	122/1	0	06	07
	122/2	0	02	90
	113/1	0	01	00
	113/2	0	02	00
	113/3	0	01	00
KANNAMBRA-I (BLOCK NO. 34)	173	0	29	00
KANNAMBRA-I (BLOCK NO. 35)	314/2	0	04	02
	314/3	0	04	05
	381	0	05	00
	383/4	0	06	00
	383/3	0	01	05
	384/1	0	15	00
	384/4	0	02	00
	384/2	0	03	00
	384/3	0	02	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	385/5	0	08	00
	385/3	0	01	00
	386/4	0	02	00
	386/7	0	10	00
	386/5	0	03	00
	386/6	0	01	02
	386/3	0	03	00
	386/2	0	01	02
	387/1	0	04	00
	388/2	0	01	00
	388/5	0	25	77
	388/8	0	01	00
	388/7	0	01	05
	389	0	02	05
	390	0	02	02
	392	0	01	00
	393	0	01	02
	394/1	0	01	00
	394/7	0	01	03
	394/8	0	01	01
	394/6	0	01	02
	394/9	0	01	00
	394/2	0	01	00
	400/1	0	01	00
	400/2	0	01	02
	400/3	0	01	03
	400/4	0	01	02
	401/10	0	08	00
	401/1	0	02	00
	402/1	0	15	00
	403/3	0	06	00
	403/6	0	03	00
	408/1	0	03	00
	408/2	0	05	00
	408/3	0	06	00
	410	0	28	00
	411/1	0	22	00
	412/1	0	03	00
	412/2	0	02	00
	412/5	0	02	75
	412/6	0	03	75
	412/7	0	04	25
	413/1	0	08	00
	413/2	0	03	02
	413/3	0	03	01
	413/8	0	01	02
	414/1	0	02	00
	415/2	0	01	00
	415/3	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	415/4	0	03	00
	416/5	0	01	02
	438/1	0	03	00
	438/3	0	01	00
	438/5	0	01	00
	439	0	02	00
	440	0	03	00
	441	0	02	00
	442/1	0	06	00
	442/2	0	02	00
	442/5	0	01	00
	442/6	0	02	01
	443/1	0	02	00
	443/2	0	02	01
	443/3	0	09	00
	443/4	0	12	00
	443/5	0	02	00
	443/6	0	01	00
	443/7	0	08	00
	443/8	0	01	00
	446/3	0	01	00
	446/2	0	01	00
	446/4	0	06	00
	446/5	0	04	00
	447/3	0	01	00
	447/4	0	02	00
	448/1	0	01	00
	448/2	0	01	75
	448/3	0	03	00
	449	0	03	00
	450	0	03	00
	451/1	0	01	00
	451/2	0	03	00
	451/3	0	04	00
	452/20	0	10	00
	452/1	0	08	00
	452/5	0	03	00
	452/21	0	02	00
	453	0	02	00
	460/7	0	06	00
	460/2	0	05	00
	460/8	0	02	00
	460/3	0	05	00
	460/9	0	01	00
	460/4	0	01	75
	460/5	0	02	00
	460/6	0	01	00
	461/1	0	02	00
	461/2	0	02	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	461/3	0	01	00
	462	0	02	00
VADAKKENCHERY-II				
(BLOCK NO. 46)	19/2	0	02	02
	19/3	0	03	20
	19/4	0	04	00
	19/5	0	02	02
	19/13	0	01	08
	19/14	0	03	00
	19/15	0	04	05
	19/16	0	09	00
	20	0	04	05
	21	0	01	82
	22/2	0	02	02
	22/3	0	03	24
	22/4	0	01	08
	28/9	0	01	21
	28/11	0	01	35
	28/12	0	02	98
	28/13	0	04	05
	28/15	0	03	34
	29/1	0	01	10
	29/2	0	01	00
	29/4	0	03	18
	29/5	0	03	24
	29/6	0	03	40
	30/1	0	01	00
	30/2	0	03	10
	30/3	0	03	90
	30/4	0	05	10
	30/5	0	00	32
	30/6	0	05	05
	30/7	0	02	14
	30/8	0	04	05
	30/9	0	04	45
	30/10	0	04	05
	31/1	0	03	18
	31/2	0	04	09
	34/1	0	04	35
	34/2	0	03	40
	34/4	0	00	90
	34/5	0	01	21
	34/6	0	06	17
	34/7	0	03	99
	34/8	0	00	25
	34/10	0	01	00
	34/11	0	01	45
	34/12	0	01	60
	34/13	0	01	71

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	34/14	0	01	62
	35/6	0	03	10
	36/1	0	02	02
	36/2	0	08	10
	40/1	0	05	14
	40/2	0	08	22
	40/3	0	04	35
	40/4	0	02	26
	40/5	0	07	00
	40/6	0	04	05
	41/2	0	02	43
	41/3	0	01	19
	42/1	0	05	10
	42/2	0	17	22
	42/3	0	00	30
	42/4	0	00	28
	42/5	0	08	00
	45	0	02	10
	53/1	0	05	00
	53/2	0	06	07
	53/3	0	04	05
	53/4	0	01	21
	53/5	0	01	00
	54/1	0	02	10
	54/2	0	02	30
	137	0	04	00
	138	0	03	50
	140/1	0	04	05
	140/2	0	08	09
	140/3	0	00	40
	141/1	0	02	02
	141/2	0	09	20
	141/3	0	01	31
	141/4	0	03	14
	143/1	0	01	13
	143/4	0	01	00
	143/5	0	01	41
	143/6	0	02	43
	143/7	0	02	10
	143/8	0	02	00
	148/1	0	01	18
	148/2	0	08	09
	148/3	0	02	18
	148/4	0	02	19
	149/1	0	30	00
	149/2	0	01	60
	150	0	02	63
	159/1	0	08	09
	159/3	0	15	08

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	160/11	0	02	37
	160/2	0	01	18
	160/5	0	00	36
	161/1	0	06	14
	161/2	0	06	07
	161/3	0	00	28
	161/4	0	01	21
	162/1	0	01	90
	162/4	0	06	10
	162/5	0	01	21
VADAKKENCHERY-II (BLOCK NO. 45)	207/3	0	48	00
	207/19	0	45	00
	207/18	0	45	00
	207/17	0	45	00
	207/16	0	45	01
	207/4	0	01	00
	207/5	0	02	00
	207/6	0	03	00
	207/7	0	01	00
	207/2	0	03	00
	207/10	0	04	00
	207/11	0	04	05
	208/1	0	06	00
	208/2	0	02	00
	208/3	0	02	04
	208/4	0	01	02
	209/1	0	03	00
	211/2	0	04	00
	211/1	0	01	00
	206/0	0	05	00
	243/1	0	10	00
	243/2	0	18	00
	243/4	0	01	00
	243/3	0	01	00
	244/3	0	03	00
	244/4	0	06	50
	244/5	0	03	00
	244/6	0	08	00
	244/7	0	04	00
	244/2	0	03	00
	245	0	15	00
	247/9	0	08	00
	247/10	0	02	00
	248/2	0	03	00
	248/10	0	02	00
	248/11	0	08	00
	248/3	0	02	00
	248/12	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	248/4	0	02	00
	248/5	0	04	00
	248/9	0	02	00
	248/6	0	18	00
	250/1	0	02	00
	250/3	0	04	00
	250/2	0	01	00
	250/7	0	13	00
	250/8	0	02	00
	250/9	0	01	00

VADAKKANCHERY-II
(BLOCK NO. 44)

8	0	02	02
9/1	0	01	00
9/2	0	08	10
9/3	0	14	94
9/4	0	03	28
9/5	0	02	48
10/1	0	04	68
10/2	0	05	94
10/4	0	01	10
10/5	0	02	02
10/6	0	05	09
10/7	0	01	90
10/8	0	01	08
11/2	0	08	10
11/3	0	01	60
11/4	0	16	00
12/2	0	02	02
12/3	0	02	43
12/4	0	02	63
19	0	02	08
20	0	03	60
21/3	0	03	40
21/5	0	05	40
21/7	0	02	24
21/8	0	00	80
21/9	0	01	02
21/10	0	02	63
22/6	0	02	98
22/7	0	02	63
22/8	0	04	68
23/1	0	05	30
23/2	0	07	20
23/3	0	06	20
23/4	0	01	08
23/6	0	02	02
23/7	0	01	02

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	23/8	0	01	90
	23/12	0	02	43
	24	0	03	10
	27/1	0	05	40
	27/2	0	02	02
	27/3	0	07	18
	27/4	0	06	48
	34/7	0	03	60
	34	0	03	00
	37/1	0	03	60
	37/2	0	07	20
	37/3	0	03	90
	37/11	0	01	18
	37/16	0	02	02
	38/2	0	04	50
	38/3	0	02	02
	38/4	0	12	60
	38/5	0	02	17
	38/8	0	05	40
	38/9	0	04	86
	39/3	0	03	24
	39/7	0	06	48
	39/8	0	03	10
	44/9	0	01	00
	44/10	0	05	90
	44/11	0	01	00
	44/12	0	02	80
	392/1	0	04	86
	392/2	0	01	62
	392/7	0	05	40
	392/8	0	02	02
	392/9	0	00	15
	392/10	0	02	48
	393/1	0	14	40
	393/2	0	02	43
	393/3	0	01	00
	393/4	0	11	34
	393/5	0	01	02
	393/6	0	01	60
	393/7	0	00	80
	393/8	0	01	10
	45/1	0	01	00
	45/2	0	07	20
	45/3	0	00	10
	45/5	0	03	10
	45/6	0	05	40
	45/7	0	02	00
	45/8	0	02	02
	45/9	0	01	21

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	45/10	0	01	82
	46/1	0	02	63
	46/2	0	03	24
	48/1	0	01	14
	48/2	0	01	00
	48/3	0	01	72
	48/4	0	02	63
	48/5	0	01	72
	48/6	0	02	90
	48/10	0	02	10
VADAKKENCHERY-I				
(BLOCK No.44)				
	80/11	0	02	00
	80/12	0	03	02
	80/1	0	01	00
	80/2	0	02	00
	80/13	0	02	03
	80/15	0	02	00
	80/16	0	01	00
	80/17	0	02	00
	80/18	0	01	00
	80/3	0	01	00
	81/4	0	01	10
	81/13	0	01	02
	81/14	0	01	00
	81/6	0	08	00
	81/9	0	01	03
	81/3	0	02	04
	81/10	0	02	07
	81/2	0	01	00
	81/4	0	02	00
	82/1	0	04	00
	82/2	0	08	00
	82/3	0	03	20
	82/8	0	00	50
	82/5	0	06	40
	82/6	0	10	00
	82/18	0	01	00
	82/20	0	01	02
	82/15	0	01	03
	82/19	0	01	10
	82/7	0	01	00
	82/9	0	03	00
	82/10	0	01	00
	82/11	0	01	02
	82/21	0	01	00
	85/1	0	04	00
	85/2	0	03	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	85/3	0	01	02
	85/4	0	04	01
	86/7	0	02	00
	86/19	0	01	80
	86/20	0	01	40
	86/22	0	00	40
	86/21	0	01	00
	86/9	0	09	00
	87/5	0	03	24
	88	0	05	20
	90	0	04	25
	98	0	04	10
	104	0	05	00
	111/1	0	00	90
	111/8	0	00	10
	111/2	0	09	00
	111/9	0	03	24
	111/4	0	01	00
	111/3	0	04	00
	111/7	0	02	07
	111/5	0	03	60
	111/6	0	02	90
	110/1	0	01	20
	110/10	0	03	15
	110/2	0	04	10
	110/4	0	00	90
	107/5	0	04	50
	107/6	0	00	15
	107/7	0	04	10
	107/9	0	06	84
	107/8	0	01	40
	109/1	0	04	50
	109/2	0	05	38
	108/2	0	16	20
	108/5	0	02	00
	108/9	0	01	02
KAVASSERY-I				
(BLOCK NO. 30)	162/9	0	00	80
	162/11	0	00	30
	163/2	0	05	35
	163/4	0	07	30
	166/1	0	01	72
	166/2	0	25	00
	167/1	0	02	10
	167/3	0	03	05
	168/4	0	05	30
	168/5	0	17	42
	190/5	0	05	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	190/6	0	02	32
	190/9	0	01	40
	190/12	0	00	80
	191/5	0	15	10
	195	0	01	20
	196/3	0	05	85
	196/4	0	06	75
	196/5	0	05	90
	197/1	0	05	40
	197/3	0	06	65
	197/6	0	04	75
	197/7	0	01	95
	197/8	0	02	10
	197/9	0	02	15
	202/1	0	00	30
	202/2	0	01	40
	202/3	0	04	75
	202/4	0	04	45
	202/6	0	07	56
	203	0	04	80
	237/2	0	13	25
	237/5	0	10	18
	236/3	0	03	08
	238/3	0	02	10
	239/3	0	08	10
	239/4	0	10	12
	239/5	0	03	29
	239/7	0	00	75
	240/3	0	06	07
	240/4	0	03	00
	240/5	0	08	40
	240/6	0	00	35
	241/8	0	05	60
	241/9	0	02	65
	241/10	0	04	15
	241/13	0	00	75
	242/1	0	00	90
	249/1	0	00	70
	249/2	0	01	08
	249/3	0	01	35
	249/4	0	02	10
	428/1	0	01	05
	272/3	0	04	05
	273/1	0	02	90
	273/3	0	02	00
	273/4	0	01	21
	273/5	0	00	15
	248	0	02	00
	428/1	0	01	05
	428/5	0	06	15
KAVASSERY-II				
(BLOCK No. 30)				
	429/1	0	03	86
	429/4	0	06	85

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	429/5	0	03	10
	429/6	0	13	80
	430/1	0	02	10
	430/2	0	02	24
	430/3	0	04	05
	430/5	0	06	07
	430/8	0	08	12
	431/1	0	01	40
	431/2	0	01	15
	431/3	0	08	00
	431/4	0	08	10
	431/6	0	00	35
	433/1	0	02	15
	433/2	0	00	30
	433/5	0	00	35
	434/1	0	04	10
	434/2	0	02	60
	434/3	0	07	21
	434/6	0	03	24
	434/7	0	06	07
	434/8	0	03	10
	434/14	0	02	40
	434/15	0	00	36
	435/12	0	04	05
	435/13	0	05	20
	436/3	0	04	26
	436/4	0	06	08
	437/3	0	03	24
	437/4	0	00	25
	438/4	0	04	05
	438/5	0	01	60
	438/9	0	02	10
	438/11	0	01	21
	458/23	0	07	60
	474	0	01	82
	666/4	0	02	40
	666/5	0	08	60
	667/2	0	08	09
	667/3	0	00	30
	668/3	0	02	10
	668/4	0	00	30
	671/2	0	08	09
	671/5	0	02	43
	672/1	0	01	21
	672/2	0	03	24
	673/1	0	03	10
	673/2	0	03	00
	673/3	0	01	95
	674	0	01	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	675/2	0	02	00
	676/1	0	05	14
	676/2	0	01	06
	677/1	0	04	05
	677/2	0	04	05
	678/1	0	01	00
	678/2	0	01	06
	678/3	0	02	02
	678/4	0	02	02
	678/9	0	01	08
	680	0	08	10
KAVASSERY-I				
(BLOCK NO. 29)				
	366	0	04	00
	367/1	0	01	10
	367/2	0	01	30
	367/3	0	06	00
	367/4	0	09	50
	367/5	0	02	00
	368/3	0	01	00
	369/1	0	00	85
	369/2	0	00	60
	369/3	0	07	80
	370/1	0	15	50
	375	0	12	00
	325	0	01	00
	378/1	0	00	20
	378/2	0	26	60
	379/1	0	10	00
	379/2	0	09	00
	379/3	0	01	20
	425/1	0	03	00
	426/1	0	01	00
	426/2	0	04	50
	427/2	0	02	06
	427/5	0	04	00
	428/2	0	01	25
	428/3	0	01	00
	428/4	0	02	50
	428/5	0	03	00
	428/6	0	08	00
	428/8	0	02	10
	428/13	0	03	15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	428/17	0	05	00
	428/18	0	01	06
	428/19	0	00	40
	428/20	0	07	50
	437/1	0	06	00
	437/2	0	05	00
	437/3	0	01	00
	437/4	0	00	98
	508/5	0	00	95
	508/7	0	01	00
	508/8	0	02	10
	509/2	0	03	00
	509/6	0	01	04
	509/7	0	00	80
	509/8	0	01	03
	509/9	0	00	60
	527/2	0	24	10
	539/2	0	06	00
	539/3	0	02	10
	539/4	0	01	00
	541/1	0	00	80
	541/2	0	03	00
	541/3	0	04	10
	541/4	0	00	70
	569/1	0	03	80
	569/2	0	01	00
	569/4	0	08	50
	569/5	0	02	00
	569/6	0	06	00
	569/7	0	01	00
	573/1	0	02	00
	574/1	0	06	50
	511/6	0	00	80
	511/7	0	01	15
	511/8	0	01	35
	511/9	0	06	00
	512/1	0	01	00
	512/2	0	04	00
	513/1	0	00	10
	513/2	0	09	50
	513/4	0	03	00
	513/5	0	02	00
	513/6	0	00	80
	529	0	00	86
	483	0	00	60
	540/1	0	01	00
	540/2	0	01	50
	540/3	0	03	50
	540/6	0	05	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	540/7	0	02	00
	540/8	0	06	00
	542/1	0	09	00
	542/2	0	01	00
	542/5	0	02	00
	542/7	0	06	60
	575/2	0	00	62
	575/3	0	01	00
	575/4	0	03	00
	575/5	0	08	00
	575/6	0	02	00
	575/7	0	01	00
	576	0	03	00
	377	0	12	14
	380/1	0	04	80
	419/1	0	13	80
	429/2	0	06	80
	436/3	0	13	60
	436/4	0	05	00
	514/6	0	03	10
	515/7	0	01	00
	528	0	00	50
	530	0	03	60
	531	0	02	40
	543/1	0	01	20
	577/1	0	02	00
	577/5	0	00	80
ALATHUR				
(BLOCK NO. 28)				
	144/1	0	02	25
	144/2	0	11	30
	144/3	0	08	50
	147/1	0	03	50
	184/7	0	02	20
	184/8	0	02	80
	185/0	0	05	00
	193/1	0	02	00
	193/4	0	03	40
	193/5	0	01	20
	193/6	0	04	00
	193/8	0	01	30
	193/9	0	04	25
	193/10	0	00	96
	193/11	0	00	95
	193/16	0	00	80
	193/17	0	01	00
	194/1	0	08	80
	190/3	0	02	00
	190/4	0	02	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	191/1	0	02	20
	192/2	0	00	30
	191/7	0	02	80
	191/8	0	03	10
	191/10	0	03	80
	191/11	0	00	20
	192/1	0	04	20
	192/3	0	04	80
	192/4	0	01	80
	192/5	0	03	40
	192/7	0	01	00
	208/1	0	02	25
	208/2	0	06	80
	208/5	0	02	00
	208/6	0	01	00
	208/7	0	02	24
	208/9	0	04	75
	208/10	0	00	98
	105/2	0	00	24
	65/15	0	01	05
	65/16	0	02	18
	65/5	0	02	08
	65/6	0	03	15
	65/7	0	01	80
	65/10	0	01	00
	63	0	02	00
ERIMAYUR (BLOCK NO.21)	46/1	0	08	07
	47/1	0	28	75
	47/2	0	07	86
	47/3	0	02	11
	48	0	01	00
	56/2	0	06	17
	56/3	0	05	56
	56/4	0	00	21
	81/5	0	00	22
	82/11	0	00	51
	115	0	02	10
	116/6	0	05	44
	116/7	0	00	73
	119	0	00	51
	120	0	02	47
	126/3	0	00	36
	61	0	02	10
	60	0	03	88
	57	0	01	10
	45	0	02	20
	44	0	02	25

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
KOZHALMANNAM-I				
(BLOCK NO.17)				
	288/7	0	00	36
	289/1	0	15	85
	289/2	0	13	44
	291/1	0	06	00
	291/2	0	04	80
	291/3	0	00	40
	291/6	0	01	40
	292/1	0	01	30
	292/2	0	01	30
	292/3	0	00	40
	292/4	0	04	70
	292/7	0	10	30
	292/8	0	04	25
	295/6	0	03	60
	295/7	0	01	60
	295/8	0	02	80
	295/9	0	02	70
	295/10	0	00	50
	295/11	0	06	40
	337/4	0	01	30
	337/5	0	05	94
	337/6	0	00	70
	337/7	0	04	44
	337/8	0	08	14
	337/9	0	01	45
	337/10	0	00	30
	338/1	0	11	22
	338/4	0	00	60
	338/9	0	13	15
	338/11	0	04	00
	338/15	0	00	80
	341/1	0	11	22
	341/4	0	00	60
	342/1	0	03	80
	342/2	0	00	40
	342/3	0	04	80
	342/4	0	08	90
	348/2	0	00	10
	348/3	0	05	22
	348/4	0	03	00
	348/5	0	00	60
	348/6	0	02	43
	349/1	0	06	00
	349/2	0	04	00
	349/4	0	09	90
	349/5	0	00	10
	356	0	02	40

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	357/13	0	00	40
	357/14	0	01	06
	357/15	0	00	10
	357/17	0	09	90
	357/18	0	00	45
	357/19	0	00	90
	358	0	05	93
	359/2	0	02	27
	359/3	0	07	56
	359/5	0	05	22
	359/6	0	00	28
	359/10	0	03	20
	360/6	0	06	03
	360/2	0	03	65
	360/3	0	02	60
	360/5	0	05	90
	360/7	0	00	35
	369/3	0	00	65
	369/4	0	05	22
	369/6	0	01	44
	369/7	0	00	40
	369/9	0	03	84
	293/8	0	02	00
	293/10	0	04	00
	339/1	0	02	00
	339/3	0	01	00
	339/4	0	00	80
	347/6	0	01	00
	347/7	0	00	80
	350/5	0	00	85
	350/6	0	00	75
	350/10	0	00	95
	363	0	00	95
	362/1	0	02	00
	362/2	0	02	06
	362/3	0	01	00
	336/7	0	02	00
	336/8	0	04	00
	352/6	0	01	00
	352/7	0	04	00

KOZHALMANNAM-I
(BLOCK NO. 16)

565/0	0	02	00
566/1	0	02	25
566/5	0	01	00
566/6	0	02	00
566/8	0	01	00
566/9	0	00	50
566/10	0	10	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	566/11	0	01	05
	566/12	0	01	00
	566/13	0	00	98
	566/14	0	00	90
	566/18	0	02	50
	566/19	0	03	00
	563/1	0	08	00
	563/3	0	03	00
	563/5	0	01	00
	417/1	0	08	80
	417/2	0	38	00
	417/5	0	32	00
	417/6	0	04	50
	417/7	0	00	85
	422/1	0	00	50
	422/2	0	02	00
	422/3	0	04	00
	424/1	0	00	90
	424/2	0	01	40
	424/3	0	03	00
	425/8	0	08	00
	425/11	0	03	00
	425/12	0	02	00
	425/13	0	01	28
	425/18	0	00	80
	429/2	0	02	00
	429/15	0	00	80
	430/1	0	08	75
	430/2	0	20	10
	430/3	0	10	15
	430/5	0	08	10
	430/6	0	00	95
	430/7	0	01	00
	430/9	0	01	10
	431	0	08	10
	179/1	0	23	00
	181/1	0	00	88
	181/2	0	02	10
	181/4	0	00	70
	182/5	0	01	00
	182/7	0	02	00
	180/1	0	01	00
	180/3	0	08	00
	180/4	0	00	90
	180/5	0	00	98
	180/12	0	04	00
	183/1	0	00	98
	183/2	0	01	28
	183/3	0	01	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	183/4	0	00	40
	183/5	0	03	70
	183/6	0	01	00
	183/8	0	00	30
	183/9	0	01	00
	147/7	0	00	60
	148/2	0	00	60
	148/3	0	00	65
	148/4	0	05	65
	148/5	0	06	00
	148/8	0	00	80
	148/9	0	01	70
	148/13	0	00	78
	148/14	0	00	98
	150/1	0	01	00
	150/3	0	00	80
	150/5	0	00	40
	150/6	0	03	00
	150/8	0	02	50
	170/6	0	01	00
	170/7	0	01	05
	170/8	0	00	80
	170/9	0	00	60
	170/12	0	00	70
	170/13	0	02	00
	171/3	0	01	70
	171/10	0	02	00
	172/1	0	00	30
	171/3	0	01	00
	171/4	0	00	80
	171/12	0	00	85
	171/13	0	01	80
	171/15	0	00	40
	173/3	0	00	80
	173/6	0	08	15
	173/7	0	10	00
	416/1	0	03	10
	416/2	0	06	00
	416/3	0	04	00
	416/5	0	00	80
	416/6	0	00	40
	416/21	0	04	00
	570/1	0	00	68
	570/2	0	03	00
	570/3	0	01	75
	571/1	0	04	10
	571/3	0	02	25
	550	0	03	00
	549	0	03	75

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	426/6	0	01	18
	569	0	02	00
	187	0	15	00
KOZHALMANNAM-II				
(BLOCK NO. 17)				
	136/6	0	00	80
	136/7	0	13	80
	137/5	0	03	15
	137/7	0	01	15
	137/8	0	02	08
	137/9	0	09	15
	138/1	0	00	90
	138/2	0	02	18
	138/3	0	08	25
	138/4	0	10	28
	139/2	0	02	10
	139/3	0	11	82
	139/4	0	08	77
	139/5	0	00	98
	139/6	0	00	30
	139/11	0	05	78
	139/12	0	03	25
	139/13	0	01	00
	140/4	0	01	80
	140/5	0	11	17
	140/6	0	11	50
	140/7	0	08	50
	140/8	0	01	20
	141/6	0	01	00
	141/7	0	10	00
	151/3	0	00	98
	151/4	0	01	00
	152/1	0	00	88
	152/2	0	25	50
	152/3	0	00	65
	153/4	0	01	25
	153/5	0	02	10
	155/6	0	02	10
	155/8	0	04	20
	155/9	0	08	18
	156/5	0	02	10
	156/6	0	04	10
	156/7	0	03	20
	156/8	0	05	75
	157/1	0	03	00
	157/2	0	02	08
	157/3	0	08	10
	157/4	0	03	05
	157/5	0	02	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	157/7	0	00	95
	157/8	0	00	60
	157/12	0	01	00
	158/1	0	03	18
	158/2	0	00	80
	159/3	0	00	20
	159/4	0	01	30
	159/5	0	02	15
	159/6	0	01	40
	159/7	0	02	00
	159/8	0	05	18
	159/9	0	00	80
	160/1	0	00	90
	160/2	0	06	35
	160/3	0	18	55
	160/5	0	03	50
	160/6	0	02	50
	160/7	0	01	75
	160/8	0	00	98
	161/1	0	01	15
	161/2	0	02	00
	167/1	0	02	05
	167/2	0	01	18
	179/1	0	03	15
	179/2	0	02	80
	179/3	0	01	98
	179/4	0	02	00
	179/5	0	00	95
	179/6	0	01	40
	179/11	0	00	88
	186/1	0	00	80
	186/11	0	00	70
	187/3	0	00	80
	187/4	0	02	70
	187/5	0	12	50
	187/6	0	00	70
	187/7	0	03	00
	187/8	0	04	37
	187/9	0	10	45
	188/9	0	01	00
	188/7	0	00	80
	188/10	0	11	00
	189/9	0	03	00
	191	0	01	00
	192/1	0	00	98
	192/2	0	01	00
	192/3	0	03	00
	192/4	0	10	00
	192/5	0	02	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	192/6	0	02	05
	192/7	0	02	50
	192/12	0	01	00
	192/13	0	00	25
	192/14	0	01	10
	193/1	0	00	98
	194	0	01	10
	285/1	0	01	15
	185/2	0	00	95
	185/3	0	00	80
	186/1	0	04	00
	287/1	0	02	00
	287/2	0	10	80
	287/3	0	11	25
	287/4	0	11	88
	287/5	0	00	95
	390/1	0	03	15
	390/2	0	00	80
	391/1	0	10	00
	391/2	0	03	00
	391/3	0	01	00
	391/4	0	02	00
KOZHALMANNA II				
(BLOCK NO. 15)				
	382	0	00	35
	383/2	0	01	62
	383/3	0	08	48
	383/4	0	07	20
	383/5A	0	00	10
	383/5B	0	00	65
	383/5C	0	00	10
	383/5D	0	05	49
	383/5E	0	03	40
	384/1	0	11	43
	391/1	0	15	30
	392/1	0	08	20
	392/2	0	06	12
	392/3	0	04	63
	392/4	0	00	50
	392/6	0	01	71
	393/2	0	01	00
	393/3	0	06	00
	393/4	0	00	15
	393/5	0	01	95
	393/6A	0	05	60
	393/7	0	03	91
	393/8	0	02	73
	393/10	0	00	53
	408/2	0	06	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	409/1	0	07	56
	409/2	0	05	40
	409/3	0	00	15
	409/4	0	16	40
	409/11	0	00	50
	410/6	0	01	30
	410/7	0	06	40
	394/4	0	03	00
	394/6	0	02	00
	386/1	0	03	00
	386/9	0	02	00
	386/10	0	01	00
	386/5	0	03	00
	386/1C	0	04	00
	390/1	0	01	05
	390/2	0	01	24
THENKURISSI-I (BLOCK NO. 18)	9/1	0	01	99
	9/2	0	08	18
	9/3	0	01	28
	8/6	0	14	08
	8/7	0	01	65
	8/11	0	04	86
	8/9	0	03	40
	8/10	0	09	89
	7/3	0	11	41
	7/4	0	06	25
	7/6	0	00	43
	7/9	0	01	00
	26/3	0	01	02
	27/1	0	02	00
	27/3	0	02	03
	27/6	0	02	06
	29/1	0	02	01
	29/2	0	03	00
	30/2	0	01	07
	30/3	0	13	59
	30/5	0	05	93
	30/6	0	05	90
	31	0	02	00
	33/2	0	00	98
	33//3	0	06	90
	33/5	0	08	64
	33/6	0	04	12
	34/2	0	06	29
	34/3	0	08	07
	34/4	0	01	45
	34/5	0	03	35

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	34/7	0	04	93
	35/1	0	02	00
	35/2	0	01	00
	36/1	0	07	70
	36/2	0	19	77
	36/3	0	05	58
	36/8	0	00	63
	38/4	0	02	67
	38/5	0	02	33
	38/7	0	01	58
	38/9	0	06	88
	38/10	0	12	66
	39/6	0	01	00
	39/7	0	01	00
	39/8	0	02	00
	39/13	0	03	00
	41/3	0	01	00
	41/8	0	01	04
	41/9	0	06	25
	43/1	0	07	82
	43/5	0	07	13
	43/7	0	05	15
	43/9	0	03	83
	42/1	0	06	27
	42/3	0	08	83
	42/5	0	05	58
	42/6	0	10	81
	55/1	0	01	00
	55/2	0	01	65
	55/18	0	03	00
	415/4	0	02	00
	415/7	0	02	05
	415/8	0	03	04
	415/12	0	04	02
	415/13	0	03	00
	418/5	0	01	00
	418/10	0	00	80
	418/17	0	00	60
	418/18	0	00	50
	418/21	0	00	90
	420/7	0	00	65
	420/9	0	00	76
	420/13	0	00	60
	420/14	0	00	70
	420/15	0	02	00
	422/1	0	01	60
	422/2	0	02	05
	422/3	0	00	80
	422/13	0	00	75

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	425/1	0	02	00
	425/2	0	01	60
	425/3	0	03	00
	425/4	0	00	75
	425/17	0	00	90
	427	0	01	02
	413/1	0	04	10
	413/2	0	07	40
	413/3	0	01	00
	413/5	0	05	60
	413/6	0	04	00
	414/1	0	13	40
	414/3	0	07	95
	414/4	0	02	16
	414/5	0	04	25
	414/8	0	04	00
	421/1	0	29	95
	421/2	0	04	85
	421/3	0	01	30
	421/8	0	23	10
	427	0	01	00
	428	0	08	00
	431/1	0	00	95
	431/2	0	08	00
	431/5	0	05	92
	431/6	0	11	11
	431/7	0	00	80
	4	0	02	50
	432	0	01	00

TALUK: PALAKKAD**KANNADI-I
(BLOCK NO. 51)**

373/3	0	07	25
373/4	0	00	25
373/5	0	03	54
373/6	0	05	61
376/1	0	05	35
376/2	0	02	73
376/4	0	13	17
379/3	0	01	45
379/4	0	07	29
379/5	0	07	47
379/6	0	08	60
381/4	0	14	84
381/5	0	01	31
381/6	0	03	89
381/7	0	03	35
381/8	0	00	30
381/10	0	01	62
381/11	0	02	43

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	381/13	0	02	02
	381/14	0	04	35
	382/1	0	04	69
	382/3	0	00	60
	382/7	0	00	50
	383/2	0	05	32
	383/3	0	00	90
	383/6	0	01	80
	384	0	05	49
	385/1	0	08	90
	394/1	0	02	60
	394/2	0	03	42
	394/3	0	08	15
	397/3	0	00	54
	397/4	0	04	40
	397/5	0	07	88
	397/6	0	09	90
	398/14	0	03	24
	401	0	15	40
	402	0	20	40
	403/3	0	04	99
	403/5	0	01	89
	427/9	0	01	15
	427/10	0	00	50
	427/11	0	01	18
	427/12	0	02	00
	427/13	0	02	40
	427/14	0	07	00
	428/5	0	05	25
	428/6	0	08	09
	428/7	0	00	30
	428/15	0	02	76
	428/16	0	00	38
	428/17	0	10	80
	438/18	0	00	65
	433/1	0	06	00
	433/2	0	01	00
	433/7	0	00	85
	433/8	0	00	68
	434/3	0	04	90
	435/1	0	14	00
	436/2	0	21	50
	380/1	0	03	00
	375/2	0	01	00
	375/3	0	06	45
	375/4	0	01	50
	375/5	0	01	00
	375/6	0	02	10
	374/7	0	01	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	374/15	0	02	55
	400/4	0	00	99
	400/10	0	01	00
	395	0	08	10
	429/1	0	04	00
	429/7	0	02	00
	429/8	0	03	15
	429/9	0	01	40
	429/12	0	00	40
	429/13	0	01	25
	437/11	0	00	80
	437/12	0	01	00
	437/14	0	01	80
KANNADI - I				
(BLOCK NO. 50)				
	191/0	0	02	20
	196/1	0	02	36
	196/2	0	02	98
	196/3	0	02	63
	196/4	0	03	24
	196/5	0	00	90
	199/8	0	06	07
	199/9	0	02	34
	199/14	0	03	60
	200/18	0	00	90
	200/20	0	01	15
	200/21	0	01	34
	207/3	0	03	45
	207/4	0	02	43
	207/15	0	03	46
	207/16	0	02	22
	208/1	0	01	21
	208/2	0	06	07
	208/3	0	04	15
	208/8	0	01	23
	209/1	0	01	90
	209/2	0	01	45
	209/3	0	03	24
	209/5	0	03	00
	209/6	0	14	18
	211/1	0	01	50
	211/2	0	02	17
	211/3	0	01	18
	211/4	0	01	35
	211/7	0	01	36
	211/11	0	04	16
	224/2	0	01	21
	224/3	0	04	25

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	224/4	0	10	12
	224/15	0	01	37
	224/5	0	03	24
	224/6	0	04	18
	224/7	0	01	90
	224/16	0	02	43
	224/11	0	03	24
	224/12	0	08	09
	224/13	0	01	21
	224/10	0	01	82
	225/12	0	05	64
	225/13	0	06	07
	225/24	0	03	19
	226/1	0	00	30
	226/2	0	04	15
	226/3	0	04	45
	226/4	0	08	90
	227/4	0	01	14
	227/5	0	00	90
	227/6	0	00	30
	227/7	0	14	40
	228/1	0	20	24
	228/2	0	00	80
	228/3	0	06	14
	228/6	0	03	09
	228/7	0	01	08
	228/8	0	00	80
	229/1	0	04	08
	241	0	03	90
	242/2	0	02	08
	242/3	0	08	37
	242/4	0	13	25
	242/6	0	03	24
	242/7	0	01	00
	194/2	0	02	10
	194/3	0	02	21
	194/4	0	05	14
	194/5	0	03	18
	194/6	0	02	90
	197/5	0	01	13
	197/6	0	08	00
	197/7	0	01	30
	197/8	0	03	21
	197/9	0	03	14
	197/12	0	12	00
	197/13	0	02	00
	210/1	0	09	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	210/2	0	11	27
	210/3	0	05	31
	210/5	0	03	14
	210/6	0	01	21
	210/8	0	01	37
	212/2	0	01	31
	212/3	0	01	27
	212/4	0	08	10
	212/5	0	03	37
	212/6	0	01	21
	212/7	0	04	05
	212/8	0	03	10
	212/9	0	04	05
	212/10	0	06	07
	212/11	0	04	10
	212/12	0	02	05
	212/19	0	02	09
KANNADI - II (BLOCK NO.50)	297/1	0	24	30
	297/2	0	18	65
	297/3	0	05	90
	297/4	0	08	49
	298/1	0	04	10
	298/2	0	05	15
	299/3	0	06	49
	299/2	0	00	20
	299/4	0	03	24
	299/5	0	12	14
	299/6	0	02	43
	299/7	0	00	80
	299/8	0	01	90
	299/9	0	01	08
	299/10	0	04	82
	299/11	0	01	93
	299/16	0	04	00
	300/5	0	03	98
	300/6	0	08	10
	300/7	0	02	10
	300/12	0	00	90
	303	0	02	63
	304/8	0	03	09
	304/9	0	02	14
	305/2	0	02	08
	305/3	0	05	00
	305/4	0	08	10
	305/5	0	04	49
	305/16	0	07	14
	305/6	0	01	19
	305/9	0	04	18

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	309/1	0	02	23
	309/4	0	01	16
	309/2	0	03	24
	309/3	0	03	10
	309/5	0	01	80
	308	0	04	18
	419/1	0	03	24
	427/1	0	03	23
	427/2	0	07	18
	427/3	0	10	20
	427/4	0	03	04
	428/7	0	06	07
	428/9	0	02	43
	428/10	0	01	82
	428/11	0	38	10
	483/6	0	09	20
	483/7	0	04	90
	483/5	0	01	00
	483/8	0	06	14
	486	0	02	13
	487/15	0	08	10
	487/16	0	06	09
	487/17	0	01	90
	487/18	0	03	10
	488/1	0	00	84
	488/2	0	10	12
	488/4	0	04	10
	488/5	0	01	09
	488/9	0	01	08
	489	0	10	12
	490	0	01	43
	506/1	0	02	20
	506/2	0	16	19
	506/3	0	06	08
	506/4	0	01	08
	506/10	0	01	21
	507/2	0	12	14
	507/4	0	08	09
	507/3	0	07	00
	507/10	0	01	13
	507/5	0	02	43
	508/13	0	08	09
	508/14	0	02	63
	519/1	0	05	17
	520/2	0	01	90
	520/6	0	06	07
	520/7	0	04	09
	521/5	0	02	10
	521/6	0	00	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	521/7	0	03	00
	521/8	0	13	00
	522/1	0	01	10
	522/2	0	02	05
	522/3	0	01	08
	522/4	0	01	10
	522/6	0	12	19
	522/7	0	11	27
	522/8	0	09	90
	523/14	0	04	43
	523/17	0	01	00
	524	0	04	43
	525	0	03	90
	528/1	0	01	10
	528/3	0	03	24
	528/4	0	01	90
	528/5	0	10	00
	528/6	0	10	12
	528/9	0	03	29
	528/10	0	03	98
	290/2	0	22	00
	290/4	0	02	00
	290/5	0	08	10
	290/6	0	04	20
	292	0	02	80
	413/1	0	14	20
	413/2	0	12	40
	413/3	0	05	80
	420/1	0	02	00
	420/2	0	03	20
	421/1	0	07	00
	421/5	0	03	20
	421/7	0	03	60
	421/8	0	00	90
	421/10	0	01	30
	421/11	0	07	80
	421/12	0	01	50
	422/8	0	05	40
	422/9	0	01	00
	422/16	0	00	20
	425/7	0	08	80
	425/8	0	00	80
	425/9	0	12	40
	425/10	0	07	80
	426/10	0	01	00
	426/11	0	08	40
	426/12	0	07	80
	426/13	0	08	20

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
KODUMBU (BLOCK NO.46)	112	0	22	00
	172	0	03	60
	173/6	0	10	62
	173/8	0	01	43
	173/9	0	02	02
	173/19	0	00	30
	173/10	0	01	60
	173/14	0	01	10
	173/13	0	00	60
	173/12	0	00	95
	174/1	0	01	43
	174/5	0	06	07
	174/8	0	01	90
	174/4	0	02	90
	186/10	0	01	21
	186/11	0	04	86
	186/12	0	01	30
	187/2	0	03	30
	187/3	0	06	70
	187/4	0	00	90
	207/2	0	27	00
	210/1	0	04	14
	210/2	0	31	50
	210/3	0	01	10
	209/2	0	04	70
	209/3	0	01	62
	209/4	0	01	10
	209/6	0	08	09
	211/1	0	10	12
	211/8	0	01	62
	215/4	0	28	10
	215/5	0	00	21
	215/6	0	00	10
	215/9	0	01	25
	216/4	0	07	17
	216/5	0	03	82
	217/1	0	00	40
	217/2	0	00	30
	217/3	0	00	30
	217/4	0	03	96
	217/5	0	05	10
	217/6	0	00	80
	217/7	0	01	90
	217/8	0	03	24
	217/9	0	09	36
	206/3	0	32	60
	206/4	0	04	80
	206/5	0	02	97
	208	0	02	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	397/1	0	00	80
	397/3	0	06	20
	397/5	0	06	40
	397/9	0	04	80
	398/1	0	15	80
	398/2	0	12	20
	401/3	0	02	12
	401/6	0	21	60
	402/10	0	10	80
	402/18	0	01	30
	402/20	0	01	05
	402/21	0	00	41
	402/26	0	00	30
	402/27	0	05	40
	614/2	0	04	82
	615/2	0	01	62
	615/3	0	02	40
	615/6	0	10	12
	615/7	0	09	00
	615/8	0	05	64
	615/9	0	06	82
	619/1,4	0	19	22
	617/8	0	10	80
	618/1	0	24	00
	618/2	0	00	80
	616/1	0	09	90
	616/3	0	01	18
	622/1	0	08	64
	623/3	0	12	24
	623/6	0	08	46
	624/5	0	02	43
	624/6	0	05	64
	624/7	0	05	90
	657	0	05	40
	658/1	0	02	90
	658/4	0	01	41
	658/5	0	09	90
	659/1	0	01	08
	659/3	0	02	43
	659/4	0	00	40
	659/8	0	02	25
	659/9	0	09	90
	659/10	0	00	80
	660/1	0	01	00
	660/3	0	14	10
	660/7	0	03	10
	660/8	0	00	10
	660/6	0	00	20
	680/6	0	03	15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	680/7	0	09	80
	681/4	0	02	00
	681/5	0	06	98
	681/6	0	05	14
	681/11	0	05	18
	682/1	0	19	44
	682/2	0	01	62
	682/3	0	02	02
	682/4	0	03	00
	682/5	0	01	00
	682/7	0	01	10
	682/8	0	11	34
	683/1	0	02	10
	683/2	0	04	40
	683/3	0	04	60
	683/4	0	00	80
	683/10	0	02	90
	684/1	0	02	16
	684/2	0	18	14
	684/3	0	02	15
	684/11	0	20	24
	685/1	0	05	00
	685/2	0	01	10
	685/3	0	08	80
	685/4	0	01	90
	685/5	0	08	00
	685/6	0	01	41
	685/7	0	02	10
	685/8	0	00	90
	685/9	0	01	42
	685/10	0	06	50
	686/1	0	03	00
	686/2	0	02	20
	686/9	0	02	43
	690/1	0	02	02
	690/2	0	05	14
	692	0	04	50
	693/1	0	08	00
	693/2	0	04	86
	693/4	0	02	23
	694	0	03	60
	695	0	04	00
	717/4	0	13	00
	717/5	0	02	43
	717/6	0	11	00
	717/8	0	00	80
	718/1	0	00	90
	718/2	0	04	00
	718/3	0	09	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	718/11	0	02	02
	719/1	0	02	40
	719/2	0	03	90
	719/3	0	06	47
	719/4	0	01	18
KODUMBU				
(BLOCK NO. 47)	9	0	40	00
	10/4	0	08	09
	11/7	0	01	10
	11/8	0	01	21
	38/2	0	03	24
	39/2	0	02	21
	39/4	0	02	43
	39/5	0	01	21
	40/1	0	02	63
	41/1	0	03	62
	42/1	0	06	07
	42/2	0	01	41
	43/1	0	03	18
	43/2	0	01	10
	43/3	0	06	07
	44/11	0	01	10
	44/12	0	01	21
	44/13	0	03	24
	45/2	0	01	30
	45/3	0	04	05
	45/4	0	01	90
	45/5	0	01	82
	46/5	0	01	10
	46/6	0	01	50
	47/1	0	01	18
	47/2	0	01	21
	48/1	0	01	50
	48/2	0	02	99
	48/3	0	01	17
	48/4	0	01	19
	105/2	0	21	00
	109/3	0	02	43
	109/4	0	10	12
	109/5	0	10	25
	109/6	0	03	19
	109/7	0	07	18
	109/8	0	10	12
	110/9	0	02	23
	110/12	0	02	43
	111/1	0	02	10
	111/2	0	04	05
	111/3	0	09	18

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	111/4	0	03	21
	111/6	0	00	41
	111/7	0	02	10
	113/1	0	04	05
	113/2	0	04	05
	113/3	0	06	07
	114/1	0	00	80
	114/9	0	05	07
	114/10	0	02	43
	114/12	0	28	00
	115/13	0	08	09
	115/15	0	01	10
	115/16	0	01	21
	115/17	0	04	05
	119/13	0	01	90
	120/1	0	02	43
	120/2	0	04	05
	120/8	0	04	10
	121/1	0	02	13
	121/4	0	01	50
	121/9	0	08	00
	121/10	0	02	43
	121/11	0	02	63
	122/1	0	00	38
	122/2	0	04	10
	122/3	0	01	43
	122/4	0	01	21
	122/5	0	02	12
	122/6	0	01	10
	122/7	0	01	90
	122/8	0	10	00
	123/2	0	08	09
	123/4	0	01	17
	123/5	0	05	14
	123/6	0	04	15
	123/7	0	01	21
	123/1	0	02	43
	123/11	0	01	21
	124/1	0	10	08
	124/2	0	02	00
	124/4	0	02	12
	124/5	0	02	21
	124/6	0	02	15
	124/7	0	01	17
MARUTHA ROAD (BLOCK NO. 38)				
	573/3	0	01	18
	573/4	0	02	21
	573/5	0	12	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	573/6	0	02	43
	573/8	0	01	08
	573/10	0	02	12
	573/12	0	04	43
	573/13	0	02	43
	575/3	0	01	21
	575/4	0	01	82
	575/5	0	02	45
	575/6	0	03	24
	575/7	0	04	86
	577/6	0	02	90
	577/7	0	03	90
	577/11	0	06	41
	577/12	0	02	43
	577/13	0	01	90
	577/14	0	01	28
	578/1	0	16	00
	578/2	0	11	00
	578/3	0	12	80
	578/4	0	01	82
	579/2	0	01	10
	579/3	0	01	21
	579/4	0	06	07
	579/5	0	03	24
	579/6	0	04	45
	585/1	0	05	64
	585/2	0	03	63
	585/3	0	04	10
	585/4	0	03	24
	585/5	0	01	18
	586/1	0	03	90
	586/2	0	03	60
	586/3	0	11	82
	586/4	0	01	90
	586/5	0	01	19
	586/6	0	03	24
	586/7	0	05	61
	587/3	0	01	62
	587/4	0	11	36
	587/5	0	01	64
	587/6	0	03	45
	587/7	0	10	12
	587/8	0	04	45
	587/9	0	01	82
	588/1	0	03	27
	588/4	0	02	66
	589/1	0	28	80
	589/2	0	01	62

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ELAPPULLY-II				
(BLOCK NO. 39)				
	6/8	0	02	10
	6/9	0	03	98
	6/11	0	02	96
	7/1	0	08	09
	7/2	0	02	10 th
	8/2	0	03	10
	8/3	0	08	90
	9/6	0	01	60
	9/7	0	10	12
	9/8	0	03	24
	9/9	0	01	21
	11/1	0	02	00
	11/2	0	04	20
	11/3	0	02	18
	11/7	0	04	05
	11/8	0	02	96
	11/9	0	06	07
	11/10	0	04	18
	11/11	0	04	05
	11/12	0	01	00
	11/13	0	01	10
	12/1	0	04	05
	16/1	0	09	15
	16/2	0	25	10
	16/3	0	04	05
	17/8	0	02	02
	17/10	0	03	24
	17/11	0	04	40
	18/1	0	01	08
	18/2	0	03	10
	18/3	0	02	02
	18/4	0	07	18
	18/5	0	11	27
	18/6	0	00	30
	18/8	0	10	12
	19/4	0	04	05
	19/5	0	03	45
	19/7	0	04	15
	20/1	0	01	00
	20/2	0	22	00
	20/3	0	04	10
	20/4	0	02	02
	20/5	0	01	00
	21/1	0	02	10
	21/2	0	01	18
	21/3	0	01	10
	57	0	02	10
	58/1	00	12	14

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	58/3	0	02	30
	63/1	0	22	00
	63/2	0	18	00
	64/1	0	04	05
	64/2	0	01	18
	65	0	04	10
	66	0	03	19
	67/1	0	08	09
	67/2	0	06	15
	67/4	0	01	39
	68/1	0	02	10
	68/8	0	03	64
	69/1	0	08	09
	69/2	0	02	02
	69/4	0	04	15
	69/5	0	07	00
	70	0	01	41
	71	0	00	90
	85/1	0	06	09
	85/2	0	02	12
	85/12	0	01	90
	85/13	0	00	35
	87/1	0	06	00
	87/2	0	08	09
	87/3	0	02	18
	87/5	0	01	00
	88/3	0	02	10
	88/4	0	08	10
	88/5	0	10	06
	88/6	0	01	80
	91/4	0	04	10
	91/7	0	02	30
	91/8	0	02	60
	91/9	0	09	80
	91/10	0	06	10
	91/11	0	07	18
	91/12	0	02	40
	91/13	0	03	40
	92/1	0	03	00
	92/2	0	02	10
	92/3	0	03	20
	92/4	0	01	18
	92/5	0	01	40
	92/6	0	01	90
	92/16	0	02	43
	93/1	0	88	00
	93/2	0	03	60
	93/3	0	09	90
	93/6	0	03	71

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	94/0	0	29	00
	102/3	0	01	01
	102/4	0	01	09
	102/5	0	02	10
	102/6	0	04	86
	132/6	0	02	20
	137/7	0	18	00
	137/1	0	00	60
	138/1	0	08	09
	138/2	0	01	50
	138/3	0	05	14
	138/6	0	07	00
	139/1	0	06	07
	139/2	0	04	10
	139/3	0	01	09
	139/4	0	02	21
	139/5	0	02	10
	142/4	0	02	21
	142/5	0	06	08
	142/6	0	08	09
	142/7	0	06	07
	142/8	0	06	09
	142/9	0	01	50
	142/11	0	03	24
	142/12	0	00	50
	142/13	0	01	00
	144/1	0	03	10
	144/2	0	06	07
	144/7	0	01	06
	144/8	0	08	18
	144/9	0	01	07
	148/1/1	0	06	09
	149/11	0	01	09
	149/12	0	17	00
	149/14	0	04	09
	149/15	0	02	60
	149/13	0	01	00
	150/1	0	00	50
	150/5	0	17	00
	150/6	0	01	80
	150/7	0	04	60
	150/10	0	11	00
	150/14	0	05	10
	150/16	0	06	07
	163/8	0	03	10
	164/1/1	0	08	10
	164/2/2	0	03	10
	164/2/1	0	01	90
	164/2/2	0	01	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	164/2/3	0	06	09
	164/2/4	0	03	14
	165/1	0	03	50
	165/2	0	06	50
	166/1	0	15	00
	166/2	0	02	20
	166/3	0	05	50
	475/1	0	05	14
	475/3	0	18	14
	475/4	0	12	20
	476/4	1	00	20
	476/5	0	04	05
	476/6	0	02	02
	476/7	0	01	10
	478/4	0	22	00
	478/5	0	20	00
	478/6	0	01	17
	479/2	0	04	10
	479/3	0	06	07
	480/3	0	02	19
	480/4	0	28	09
	480/5	0	18	10
	481/1	0	18	20
	481/2	0	08	00
	481/7	0	06	07
	481/3	0	01	90
	481/8	0	02	02
	484/1	0	15	60
	484/3	0	02	15
ELAPPULLY-II				
(BLOCK NO.40)	40/10	0	10	12
	41/2	0	08	64
	41/1	0	01	05
	41/4	0	07	20
	41/5	0	06	12
	42/5	0	05	40
	42/6	0	00	40
	42/7	0	09	29
	42/8	0	01	08
	42/9	0	01	09
	42/10	0	12	96
	42/11	0	00	80
	42/3	0	01	10
	43	0	02	63
	44	0	01	15
	49/1	0	02	82
	49/2	0	18	00
	49/3	0	05	64

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	53/1	0	03	49
	53/2	0	01	20
	53/4	0	03	26
	54/1	0	00	21
	54/2	0	00	15
	54/3	0	00	10
	54/4	0	00	90
	54/5	0	06	07
	54/6	0	01	45
	55/1	0	01	09
	55/2	0	03	90
	55/3	0	06	07
	55/4	0	19	80
	55/5	0	13	68
	56/4	0	10	00
	56/10	0	10	00
	57/5	0	09	10
	57/6	0	03	82
	57/9	0	06	30
	58/5	0	12	24
	101/1	0	01	10
	101/5	0	05	76
	101/8	0	25	74
	101/9	0	01	01
	101/10	0	01	82
	101/11	0	02	90
	101/12	0	00	59
	101/6	0	01	15
	101/7	0	01	25
	102/5	0	22	10
	102/2	0	02	10
	102/7	0	13	00
	102/3	0	01	10
	102/8	0	01	00
	102/4	0	01	12
	102/9	0	03	09
	120	0	15	00
	121/1	0	03	90
	121/2	0	02	10
	121/3	0	00	42
	121/4	0	01	18
	121/6	0	15	00
	121/7	0	01	05
	121/10	0	00	90
	121/11	0	00	30
	121/12	0	00	98
	121/13	0	00	15
	121/9	0	01	15
	121/14	0	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	122/11	0	09	25
	123	0	29	70
	131	0	20	00
	132	0	22	00
	133/3	0	03	24
	133/4	0	00	40
	133/5	0	01	02
	133/6	0	05	28
	133/7	0	00	60
	134/2	0	01	08
	134/1	0	10	00
	134/4	0	13	50
	134/5	0	06	07
	134/6	0	04	68
	134/7	0	08	64
	135/1	0	02	98
	135/2	0	00	90
	135/4	0	02	02
	135/5	0	10	12
	151/1	0	01	05
	151/4	0	00	80
	151/3	0	01	02
	151/5	0	01	26
	151/6	0	10	80
	151/7	0	04	08
	151/8	0	01	98
	167/4	0	12	60
	167/5	0	01	98
	167/6	0	00	92
	167/10	0	23	40
	167/7	0	00	50
	167/8	0	00	41
	167/9	0	00	52
	168/2	0	08	90
	168/6	0	01	12
	168/4	0	11	70
	168/5	0	02	05
	169/6	0	00	80
	169/7	0	08	55
	169/8	0	00	90
	169/9	0	07	18
	87/6	0	01	12
	99/3	0	04	00
	99/9	0	01	15
	99/12	0	01	20
	99/7	0	00	40
	100/4	0	05	02
	152/7	0	01	15
	152/8	0	00	95

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	152/9	0	01	10
	173/2	0	06	78
ELAPPULLY-I (BLOCK NO.40)	150/1	0	17	00
	150/2	0	04	10
	177	0	14	76
	178/3	0	00	90
	178/6	0	04	32
	178/8	0	01	01
	178/9	0	02	08
	178/10	0	10	80
	179/5	0	01	10
	179/6	0	04	32
	179/7	0	04	50
	179/8	0	01	62
	180/5	0	12	60
	183/1	0	05	40
	183/2	0	06	09
	183/3	0	00	22
	182/1	0	07	92
	182/3	0	05	76
	182/4	0	05	40
	182/5	0	05	04
	181/2	0	00	90
	181/5	0	02	02
	181/8	0	00	90
	181/9	0	00	05
	181/10	0	00	30
PUDUSSERI (W) (BLOCK NO. 36)	539/8	0	10	80
	539/9	0	02	60
	539/10	0	00	90
	539/11	0	01	21
	540/1	0	01	10
	540/8	0	08	64
	540/10	0	03	96
	540/18	0	01	21
	540/19	0	12	60
	542	0	04	86
	543/10	0	01	21
	543/11	0	05	25
	543/12	0	06	17
	547/2	0	25	00
	548/1	0	26	10
	548/2	0	00	90
	548/3	0	01	82

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	552/1	0	05	14
	552/2	0	06	07
	552/3	0	01	10
	552/4	0	01	43
PUDUSSERI CENTRAL				
(BLOCK NO.34)				
	480/2	0	08	20
	483/4	0	00	60
	484/2	0	26	80
	484/3	0	03	60
	484/4	0	01	00
	484/5	0	22	40
	484/6	0	02	20
	486/2	0	01	40
	486/4	0	06	50
	546/2	0	49	60
	547/2	0	01	20
	560/1	0	01	40
	560/2	0	27	00
	560/4	0	00	60
	561/2	0	01	40
	561/3	0	02	80
	561/4	0	01	60
	566/7	0	09	00
	567/1	0	02	00
	567/4	0	00	60
	568/3	0	39	20
	568/4	0	18	00
	570/3	0	01	80
	570/6	0	00	60
	571	0	03	60
	575/1	0	19	40
	575/2	0	01	40
	575/7	0	07	20
	575/5	0	00	50
	575/8	0	01	40
	575/9	0	00	30
	576/1	0	21	20
	577/1	0	19	80
	577/2	0	04	10
	578/2	0	01	30
	589/0	0	18	00
	485/1	0	01	80
	485/2	0	07	80
	485/3	0	03	90
	485/6	0	09	20
	487/1	0	07	20
	487/2	0	07	00
	487/3	0	06	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	488/1	0	14	00
	490/1	0	01	00
	545/1	0	01	80
	545/2	0	06	20
	588	0	04	00
	598/0	0	02	20
PUDUSSERI EAST				
(BLOCK NO. 33)				
	158/3	0	01	40
	158/17	0	05	80
	158/16	0	01	20
	158/7	0	06	07
	158/8	0	03	20
	159/2	0	01	60
	159/8	0	19	20
	159/9	0	08	80
	159/10	0	04	80
	192	0	01	80
	190/5	0	02	10
	190/6	0	31	20
	190/8	0	08	09
	189/4	0	09	20
	188/1	0	03	10
	188/3	0	05	20
	188/4	0	06	07
	187	0	39	00
	180/4	0	11	80
	180/5	0	04	00
	180/6	0	00	10
	181/8	0	00	25
	181/14	0	01	00
	210/3	0	07	20
	210/4	0	01	00
	209	0	06	12
	213/1	0	14	10
	213/2	0	02	20
	213/4	0	06	12
	212/1	0	01	60
	212/3	0	28	10
	212/4	0	02	00
	215/1	0	01	10
	215/6	0	04	00
	215/7	0	06	50
	215/8	0	02	00
	215/9	0	01	10
	215/11	0	02	71
	216/1	0	08	00
	216/3	0	01	62
	229/2	0	04	60

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	229/3	0	05	14
	230/1	0	03	15
	230/3	0	05	00
	230/4	0	03	15
	230/8	0	05	00
	228/1	0	06	10
	228/12	0	05	00
	228/13	0	06	14
	228/9	0	07	00
	228/16	0	07	60
	226/0	0	34	00
	223/2	0	05	14
	223/3	0	15	20
	225/2	0	26	00
	225/1	0	08	09
	224	0	09	00

[F. No. R-31015/12/98-OR-III]
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 17 अगस्त, 1999

कांआ० 2549.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एन०ई०पी०सी० एयरलाइन्स के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं०-1, मुंबई के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-30012/61/97-आई०आर० (सी-1)]
श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th August, 1999

S.O. 2549.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. I.B.P. Co. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-8-99.

[No. L-30012/61/97-IR(C-1)]
S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

Shri Justice C.V. Govardhan, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-22 OF 1998

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. I.B.P. Co. Ltd.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Management : Shri A. H. Patel, Advocate.

For the workmen : Shri S. D. Chilka, Unit Secretary of Petroleum Emp. Union.

STATE : Maharashtra.

Mumbai, dated this the 06th day of August, 1999

AWARD

The Government of India by its order dated 30th June, 1998 has referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. I.B.P. Co. Ltd. and their workmen for adjudication by this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of General Manager (P&A), I.B.P. Co. Ltd., Western Region, in denying to make payment of Rs. 215 to Blue and White collar cadre employees w.e.f. 1-10-93 is justified? If not, to what relief should be granted?"

On 16-7-1999 Shri A.M. Patel, Advocate for the management has submitted an application and states that they have settled the dispute amicably out of the Court and prayed that the matter may be disposed off as settled and withdrawn. The application has been signed by Shri G. S. Purab, General Secretary of the Union, Shri S.D. Chilka, Unit Secretary and

2564 GI/99—23.

S.M. Rabim, Manager (P&IR) respectively. Today, Shri S.D. Chilka, Unit Secretary for the Union and Shri A.H. Patel, Advocate for the management appeared for the parties consented the above application. Therefore the matter is disposed off as settled and withdrawn and an award is passed accordingly.

C. V. GOVARDHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 अगस्त, 1999

कांआ० 2550.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एन०ई०पी०सी० एयरलाइन्स के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 1, मुंबई के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-11012/22/98-आई०आर० (सी-1)]
श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th August, 1999

S.O. 2550.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of N.E.P.C. Airlines and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-8-99.

[No. L-11012/22/98-IR(C-1)]
S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

Shri Justice C.V. Govardhan, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-50 OF 1998

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of N.E.P.C. Airlines.

AND

Their workman Shri Yashvijay Parmar.

APPEARANCES :

For the Management : No appearance.

For the workman : Shri Mohan Bir Singh, Advocate.

STATE : Maharashtra.

Mumbai, dated this the 04th day of August, 1999

AWARD

The Central Government has referred the following dispute between the employer N.E.P.C. Airlines, Madras and their workman Shri Y. Parmar for adjudication by this Tribunal :

"क्या इन ई.पी.सी. एयर लाईन्स द्वारा श्री यशो-विजय परमार, सिग्निट कमांडर की सेवाएं 31.3.97 से समाप्त किया जाया औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धाराओं के अन्तर्गत नया न्यायोचित था? यदि नहीं तो, कर्मचारी किस राहत के पात्र हैं?"

The management or their representative never appeared nor filed any claim before this Tribunal. Mr. Mohan Bir Singh, Advocate for the workman filed two affidavits on behalf of the workman today. Today also the management or their representative not appeared. Hence, it appears that the management is not interested in contesting the reference. In the result, an award is passed in favour of the workman. Reference is disposed off.

C. V. GOVARDHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 अगस्त, 1999

का०अ० 2551.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एन०ई०पी०सी० एयरलाइंस के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं-1, मुंबई के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-11012/66/98-आई०आर० (सी-1)]

श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th August, 1999

S.O. 2551.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of N.E.P.C. Airlines and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-8-99.

[No. L-11012/66/98-I.R. (C-1)]

S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

Shri Justice C. V. Govardhan, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. CGIT 14 OF 1999

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of N.E.P.C. Airlines Ltd.

AND

Their workman Shri S. S. Ezedayar.

APPEARANCES :

For the Management : No appearance.

For the Workman : No appearance.

State : Maharashtra

Mumbai, dated this the 04th day of August, 1999

AWARD

The Central Government has referred the following dispute between the employer N.E.P.C. Airlines, Chennai and their workman Shri Sushri Siman Ezedayar for adjudication by this Tribunal :

“क्या एन.ई.पी.सी. एयरलाइंस के प्रबंधन द्वारा दि. 10.11.97 से सुश्री सिमिन इजेदयार, एयर होस्टस की सेवाएं समाप्त किया विधिवत एवं व्यापकित है? यदि नहीं तो वे किस राहत के पात्र हैं?”

The management or their representative never appeared nor filed any claim before this Tribunal inspite of notices dated 10-3-1999, 10-5-1999 & 13-7-1999. On 07-5-1999 the workman was present and prayed for time to file his statement of claim. Thereafter he never appeared nor filed any claim before this Tribunal. Today also the workman is not present nor filed any claim inspite of notice dated 13th July, 1999 served on him. Hence, it appears that both the parties are not interested in contesting the reference. In the result, an ex-parte award is passed in favour of the management. Reference is disposed off.

C. V. GOVARDHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०अ० 2552.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसेज बी.सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं-2, धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/122/04-आई०आर० (सी-1)]

श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2552.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No.-2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-8-99.

[No. L-20012/122/94-I.R. (C-1)]

S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. B. Chatterjee, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 70 OF 1995

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of South Govindpur Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : None.

On behalf of the employees : Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar. INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 10th August, 1999

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/(122)/94-I.R. (Coal-I), dated, the 19th April, 1995

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the General Manager, Govindpur Area No. III of M/s. BCCL., P.O. Sonardih, Dist. Dhanbad in denying to refer Shri Mahesh Singh, Prop Mistry to the Apex Medical Board for assessment of the loss of his eyesight is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. It reveals from the record of this reference that the workman side abstained from taking any steps although several notices were issued to them. The management side, however represented through their learned Advocate. This reference is pending since early part of 1995 and it is of no use to drag the same for taking steps by the workman side any more. Under such circumstances, a 'No dispute' Award is being rendered and the reference is disposed of on 'No dispute' Award basis on the presumption of non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties presently.

B. B. CHATTERJEE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

कांअं० 2553:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी सी सी एल के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 2, धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012(21)94-आई०आर० (सी-I)]
श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2553.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCC Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-8-99.

[No. L-20012/(21)/94-IR(C-1)]
S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. B. Chatterjee, Presiding Officer.
In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 10 OF 1995

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Katras Chaitudih Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workmen : None.

On behalf of the employers : Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar. INDUSTRY : Coal.
Dated, Dhanbad, the 9th August, 1999

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012(21)/94, I.R. (Coal-I), dated, the 21st February, 1995.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Katras Chaitudih Colliery under Katras Project Area of M/s. BCCL in superannuating Shri Kail Dusadh, Tyndal Jamadar, w.e.f. 1-7-93 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

2. In this reference the workman side neither appeared before this Tribunal nor took any steps although several notices were issued to them. The management side all along represented before the Tribunal through their learned Advocate Shri B. Joshi. The reference is pending since 1995 and it is of no use to drag the same any more. Under such circumstances a 'No dispute' Award is being rendered and the reference is disposed of on 'No dispute' Award basis on the presumption of non-existence of any industrial dispute between the workman and the management presently.

B. B. CHATTERJEE, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

कांअं० 2554:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी सी सी एल के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं०-2, धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/203/95-आई०आर० (सी-I)]
श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2554.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-8-99.

[No. L-20012/203/95-IR(C-1)]
S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. B. Chatterjee, Presiding Officer.
In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 81 OF 1996

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Jogidih Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None.

On behalf of the employers : None.

STATE : Bihar. INDUSTRY : Coal.
Dated, Dhanbad, the 10th August 1999

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/203/95-IR(Coal-I), dated, the 20/21st August, 1996.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the Union for regularisation of the services of Shri Rampit Singh Prop. Ministry as D/G. Mun. Bd with all fringe benefits since 1982 is justified? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. In this reference both the parties abstained from appearing before this Tribunal and taking any steps although several notices were issued to them. The reference is pending since 1996 and it is of no use to drag the same year after year for taking steps by the parties. Under such circumstances a 'No Dispute' Award is being rendered and the reference is disposed of on 'No dispute' Award basis on the presumption of non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties presently.

B. B. CHATTERJEE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का० आ० 2555—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स सी०सी०एल० के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं-2, धनबाद को पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/416/95-आई०आर० (सी-1)]

प्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2555.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure to the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s C.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-8-99.

[No. L-20012/416/95-IR.(C-I)]

S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. B. Chatterjee, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 1 OF 1997

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of M/s Central Coalfields Ltd's N.K. Area and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workmen : None.

On behalf of the employers : None.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad the 9th August, 1999

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/416/95-IR. (Coal-I), dated, the 31st December, 1996.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the claim of the Union that the management of N. K. Area, Central Coalfields Ltd., is not allowing the duty to Sh. Charan Bhatia w.e.f. 24-5-1993 till date (resumption of duty) and their demand for wages for the relevant period is proper and justified? If so, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. In this reference none of the parties turned up before this Tribunal now took any steps although notices were issued to them again and again. The reference is pending before this Tribunal since 1997 and it is of no use to drag the same any more. Under such circumstances, a 'No dispute' Award is being rendered and the reference is disposed of on 'No dispute' Award basis on the presumption of non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties presently.

B. B. CHATTERJEE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2556—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स हल्दिया रिफाइनरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कलकत्ता के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/59/97-आई०आर० (सी-1)]

प्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2556.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Haldia Refinery and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-8-99.

[No. L-20012/59/97-IR.(C-I)]

S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 25 of 1998

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Haldia Refinery, of Midnapore.

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice A. K. Chakravarty, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Management.—Mr. S. Padhi, Personnel & Admin. Manager with Mr. D. R. Khatua, Sr. Personnel & Admin. Officer.

On behalf of Workmen.—Mr. J. Panda, General Secretary with Mr. R. K. Giri, Secretary of the union.

SEATH : West Bengal **INDUSTRY :** Petroleum

AWARD

My Order No. L-30012/59/97-PR(Coal-I) dated 30th June, 1998 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Haldia Oil Refinery of I.O.C. Ltd., in not granting special leave to the office-bearers of non-recognised union at par with the recognised union for the purpose of attending discussions/conciliations is justified? If not, to what relief the other unions are entitled?"

2. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Employees' Organisation, Haldia Refinery, P.O. Haldia Oil Refinery, Distt. Midnapore-721606(W.B.) (in short the sponsoring union) has raised this industrial dispute challenging the order of the management of Haldia Oil Refinery of I.O.C. Ltd. for not granting special leave to the office bearers of the non-recognised unions at par with the recognised union while attending discussions or conciliations.

3. Union's case, in short, is that by its letter dated 14-7-1996 it raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Calcutta, complaining discrimination of the management in granting special leave/time-off to the office-bearers of the sponsoring union while attending conciliation proceedings. It is alleged that the management sanctioned allowed to the executive of the Haldia Refinery Employees' Union special leave/day-off for any bipartite/tripartite meeting and conciliation proceedings. Such action of the management in granting special leave/day-off to the representatives of registered union shows that they have discriminated by not allowing the same privilege/facility to the sponsoring union violating thereby provisions of Item 2(b) of Fifth Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. All attempts of conciliation by the conciliation officer having failed in this matter as the management refused to sanction special leave/day-off to the office-bearers of the sponsoring union, he referred the matter to the Central Government, which culminated in the present reference. The union has accordingly prayed for grant of time-off special leave equally to all registered trade unions functioning in this industry including employees representing the management without any discrimination.

4. Management of Haldia Oil Refinery of I.O.C. Ltd. (in short the management) filed a written statement, alleging inter alia that the sponsoring union has no locus standi and/or any authority to raise an industrial dispute and union's prayer for special leave/time-off to its office-bearers in wholly misconceived and cannot be a subject matter of an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Management denied that any special leave/time-off is allowed to any other union. Management has further alleged that there is no rule under which any special leave/time-off is allowed to any office-bearers of a trade union raising a dispute before the conciliation officer. Management also denied that the executives of the Haldia Refinery Employees' Union (recognised) are granted special leave/day-off for attending conciliation meeting. Management also denied that by not granting special leave/day-off to the office-bearers of the sponsoring union they have violated the provisions of Item 2(b) of the Fifth Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is alleged that as per Code of Discipline certain facilities/benefits are required to be provided to the recognised registered unions only. It is also alleged that raising of an industrial dispute by an union is union activity and to attend conciliation for that dispute by the office-bearers of the union is not the Corporation's work for which they can claim special leave/time-off. Management also denied that the action of the Corporation is ultravires to the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Management accordingly prayed for dismissal of the case of the union.

5. The union filed a rejoinder, alleging inter alia that the Central Government having referred the matter for adjudication, the question of absence of the name of any representative in the reference is immaterial. Rest of the rejoinder is merely argumentative and reiteration of its own case in its written statement.

6. Heard Mr. S. Padhi and Mr. D. R. Khatua on behalf of the management and Mr. J. Panda and Mr. R. K. Giri for the union.

7. Apart from production of certain documents by both the parties, they have examined one witness each in this case.

8. Before proceeding to discuss the matter on merits it is necessary to consider the preliminary points raised by the management in this case. It was submitted by Mr. Padhi on behalf of the management that the reference is not maintainable in its present form as the reference is for consideration of the rights and privileges of the office-bearers of the union without actually naming who these office-bearers are. It is true that there may be number of office-bearers in the union and unless it is specifically stated about the particular office-bearers by name, who will be affected by this order, the reference becomes vague and indefinite. Even the position of the office-bearers like president, vice-president or secretary having not been mentioned in the order of reference, it is difficult to pass any order only on the vague mentioning of the office-bearers without any particular what-so-ever. To that event the reference must be said to be bad. Even assuming that

such description relates to all the office-bearers of the union, any favourable order passed by the Tribunal in favour of the workmen shall amount to passing of a blanket order in favour of all the office-bearers of the union. That certainly shall not be permissible.

9. The point that is next urged upon by Mr. Padhi that no industrial dispute being in existence in this case, the reference is totally misconceived and it should be rejected in limine. For this purpose he drew my attention to Section 2(k) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 which runs as follows "Industrial Dispute means any dispute or difference between employers and employers, or between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment of the terms of employment or with the conditions of labour, of any person." It was submitted by Mr. Padhi that all dispute between employers and workmen cannot be an industrial dispute and it can only be an industrial dispute if such dispute fulfills the twin considerations of (i) employment or non-employment or condition of labour and (ii) of any person. According to him the union does not fulfill any of these two conditions. The demand made by the union in this case is not connected with the employment of non-employment or terms of employment or condition of labour and no workman being involved in this reference it cannot relate to any person. The union obviously being formed for the purpose of protecting the interest of the workman it has not role to play apart from representing the cause of the workmen for whom it exists. Without claiming any right for or on behalf of any workman, it itself cannot claim any right excepting what is provided under the law. The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 certainly is primarily intended for protection of the right of industrial workmen but not of the unions representing them. That being so, no industrial dispute having been raised in this case, the entire reference is totally misconceived and liable to be rejected on this account alone.

10. Though it is not strictly necessary in the above context of non-maintainability of the reference, still then, the parties having adduced evidence on merit, it is necessary to examine the evidence on record to see how far the union has succeeded in proving its case that the management was bound under any law to provide special leave/day-off to these office-bearers of the union when they attend conciliation proceeding. The union has failed to produce any law to show that it is entitled to get such benefit. There is substantial force in the argument of Mr. Padhi that since it is union's business to raise industrial dispute it has got to do it and the management cannot be made to forego the loss of service of the workmen consequent upon such attendance before the conciliation officer. Mr. Panda, representative of the union, however, drew my attention to Item 2(b) of the Fifth Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in support of his contention that the management is bound to provide those facilities to the office-bearers of the sponsoring union. He also submitted that the management was granting special leave and day-off in terms of its Code of Discipline and Facilities to the Recognised Union. He drew my attention to

the provisions of Item No. 20.2.2.1 and 20.2.2.2 of the above Code from which it will appear that there is a provision, while enumerating the rights of the recognised unions, that one or two of the office-bearers of the union may be given time-off to attend proceeding before the conciliation officer or Tribunal if such proceeding is held locally and special casual leave also can be granted if required. According to Mr. Panda since these facilities are available to the recognised union, the non-recognised union cannot be denied those benefits. Mr. Padhi, representative of the management submitted that recognised union and non-recognised union stand on entirely two different footings and the management can grant privileges and facilities to the recognised union without granting the same to others. It appears from the evidence of Bikash Pal who was examined as MW-1 in this case that there are as many as three unions in the establishment and out of the same only one union is recognised. Recognised union is Haldia Refinery Employees' Union and the non-recognised unions are Haldia Refinery Employees' and Workers' Union and Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Employees' Organisation, Haldia Refinery. This position was not challenged by the union and Mr. Jotirmoy Panda examining himself as WW-1 in this case admitted that the sponsoring union is not a recognised union.

11. Item No. 2(b) of Fifth Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 while describing what constitutes unfair labour practice lays down that "an employer showing partiality or granting favour to one of several trade unions attempting to organise his workmen or to its members, where such a trade union is not a recognised trade union." On a plain reading of this provision it will be clear that this provision clearly has no application in this case. This provision forbids discrimination between non-recognised trade unions. It has got nothing to do with recognised trade union. So, if the management offers some benefits or privileges to the recognised trade union that is not prohibited under this provision. Further showing of partiality or granting of favour should not be made while the trade union attempts to organise its workmen. The meaning of 'organise' as per Webster's New World Dictionary is "(1) to provide with an organic structure; esp. (a) to arrange in an orderly way (b) to bring into a unified, coherent form (c) to make plans and arrange for (2) to bring into being; establish (3) to enlist in, or cause to form, a labour union (4) (colloq.) to set (oneself) into an orderly state of mind—viz. 1. to become organised 2. to form an organisation, esp., a labour union." In the present context organise would necessarily mean the formation of a labour union and all steps leading to such formation. Conciliation proceeding is certainly not a proceeding in respect of formation of a labour union and therefore this provision has absolutely no application in the instant case. It is therefore clear that the management acted absolutely within its right in granting some special privileges to the recognised trade union. The action of the management in providing certain privileges to the office-bearers of the trade union as per its Code of Discipline and Facilities to Recognised Unions (Ext. M-2) accordingly cannot be challenged. Then again, even assuming for argument's sake that the management adopted unfair

labour practice, as alleged by the union, the union shall not be entitled to the relief as prayed for by it because the penalty for commission of unfair labour practice is provided in Section 25U of the Industrial Disputes Act. So, on any view of the matter this provision does not come to any help to the union in the matter.

12. Mr. Panda, representative of the union then referred to Rule 33 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. This has absolutely no application because it deals with expenses of witness and has no concern with the granting of special leave or time-off as prayed for in this case. Mr. Panda admitted in his evidence that this provision has no application and accordingly the relief prayed for by the union in this case cannot be allowed.

13. The reference itself being misconceived and not maintainable and the union having hopelessly failed to show any basis for the claim it has made, I am to hold that the action of the management of the Haldia Refinery of the Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. in not granting special leave to the office-bearers of the non-recognised unions at par with the recognised union for the purpose of attending discussion and conciliation is perfectly justified. That being so, the union shall not be entitled to any relief whatsoever in this case.

This is my Award.

Dated, Calcutta,
The 9th August, 1999.

A. K. CHAKRAVARTY, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2557 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमि० के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण गुवाहाटी के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-30012/01/96-आई०आर० (सी-1)]

श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1999

S.O. 2557.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Guwahati as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Gas Authority of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18th August, 1999.

[No. I-30012/01/96-IR(C-D)]
S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, GUWAHATI,
ASSAM

REFERENCE NO. 3(C) OF 1997

PRESENT :

Shri K. Sarma, B.A., LL.B.,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Guwahati.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute between :
The management of Gas Authority of India, Limited.

Vs.

S/Shri Sajal Bhowmik and Suniti Chakravorty.

APPEARANCE :

Shri P. Deka, Advocate—For the Management.
Shri G. P. Bhowmik, Advocate—For the workmen.

Date of Award : 27th July, 1999.

AWARD

This Industrial dispute has been referred to by the Desk Officer, Government of India, Ministry of Labour under memo. No. L-30012/01/96-IR (Coal-I) dated 11th March, 1997 to adjudicate the dispute arising between the management of Gas Authority of India Limited and Shri Sajal Bhowmik and another on the following issue :—

"Whether the claim of S/Shri Sajal Bhowmik and Suniti Chakravorty for their reinstatement of services by the management of Gas Authority of India Limited Sibsagar (Assam) is legal and justified? If so, to what relief are these persons entitled?"

On receipt of the reference, this Tribunal has registered this case and issued notice to both the parties calling upon them to file their written statements and exchange their documents in support of their claim in response to which both the parties have appeared and filed their written statements and Addl. written statement in support of their respective claim alongwith some documents. It is to be mentioned that on one of the workmen Shri Suniti Chakravorty has filed a separate written statement stating that he has already been appointed by the Management as Account Asstt, Grade III in Tripura Office with effect from 17th December, 1996 and hence no claim against the management and accordingly dispute against him has been dropped.

The workmen's case as reflected in his written statement in brief is that he was working in the GAIL Office at Sibsagar Branch up to 28-8-95 and on aforesaid date his service was terminated by the management without assigning any reason. His further contention is that he has completed 240 days of service, and hence his service should be automatically made permanent. In para 4 of written statement workmen he has stated that he joined in the service of the management i.e. GAIL as contract labour through the audit firm under the name and style of M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates. The management has accepted him as their workmen and hence his service should be regularised by the management. In support of the contention he has submitted a letter dated 16-8-95 addressed to the Branch Manager of S.B.I., O.N.G.C. colony certifying him as their Accountant Asstt. by Finance & Account Officer of management. (B) application dated 9-8-95 filed by the workmen to the Finance & Accounts Officer of the management for sanctioning leave and also acceptance of Rs. 3000/- on 18-6-94 vide Cheque No. 123982 of S.B.I. Jorhat Branch as financial advance. All these documents have proved that he is a regular worker of the management and hence his termination from the service is illegal and hence he should be ordered to be regularised.

The management case, on the otherhand, in brief, is that the workmen Shri S. Bhowmik was never their workman nor they have appointed him at any point of time. Their contention is that the GAIL formed under the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas involved in the extraction of L.P.G. Fraction of Natural Gas alongwith other Commercial activities and with this object in view the company had taken up the job of setting up of L.P.G. recovery at Iakuwa, Sibsagar and also taken up work of old Gas pipeline installation under public sector enterprise namely Oil & Natural Gas Company Assam, Tripura and Eastern Sector. The Company, instead of engaging permanent man power, for

establishing their business has entered into contract with M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates, the Chartered Accountants Firm, 305 Sitaram, Mansion, 728 Joahi Road, Karol Bagh with a Branch Office at Dibrugarh at Eastern Region to look after finance and accounting services of GAIL at North Eastern Region vide letter dated 26-2-93. The present workman Shri S. Bhowmik who was the direct employee of the above M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates Firm was deployed to GAIL Office in Assam to discharge their obligations under the contract vide letter dated 27-6-95 along with other workmen. This being the position the management has denied of having any relationship of employer and employees with workman Shri S. Bhowmik. It is also contended that the workman Shri S. Bhowmik was under administrative, Supervisory and disciplinary control of the M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates Firm which is evidence from the letter dated 14-7-95 written by Shri S. Bhowmik to M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates, Chartered Accountants Firm to allowing him to leave the station for medical treatment. It is also submitted that M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates has withdrawn the services of workman Shri S. Bhowmik vide letter No. SKB/08/02 dated 28-8-95 from the office of the GAIL and took him back to their firm. All these facts and circumstances of case show that Shri S. Bhowmik an employee of M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates and was not the employee of the GAIL at any point of time and hence question of his regularisation does not arise. In support of aforesaid contention the management has exhibited some document, such as ext. B, a letter written by the management of M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates requesting firm to depute 4 worker i.e. Accounts Asstt. to work in their office. Ext. O is a letter written by M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates deputing 4 workmen including present workman to work in their office. Ext. E, is a copy of letter written by workman Shri S. Bhowmik to M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates seeking leave due to his illness Ext. D, is a letter written by M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates informing him to discontinue of the service of the present workman along with another workman Shri Suniti Chakravarty on and from 28-8-95. Ext. F, is a copy of representation submitted by aforesaid two workmen requesting the management for regularisation of their service. Ext. G, is a copy of letter written by Shri S. Bhowmik to management asking for advance payment of Rs. 6000. Ext. H, is a copy of letter written to Shri S. Bhowmik by M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates intimating him to discontinue his service.

Both the management and workmen have adduced oral evidence and exhibited the documents in support of their respective claim.

I have heard the argument advanced by Shri P. Deka, learned advocate appearing for the management and also that of Mr. G. P. Bhowmik, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the workmen.

Mr. P. Deka, learned advocate appearing for the management has submitted that present dispute between the management and the workman Shri S. Bhowmik is not an industrial dispute within the meaning Section 2(K) of the Industrial Dispute Act, because management is not the principal employer of the workman. He has further submitted that Shri S. Bhowmik is an employee of M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates Firm who has worked in GAIL Office on behalf of said firm. This being so, the workman Shri S. Bhowmik is a contract labour under the provision of contract labour (Regulation and Abolition Act) 1970. As the contract labour has not been abolished by the appropriate Govt. by issuing notification under section 10 of the said act, the workman can not raise this dispute against the management as there is no direct relationship of employer and employee between the workman and the management. In support of this contention he has drawn my attention

Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition Act) 1970 which runs as follows :—
 “Prohibition of employment of contract labour—(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this act, the appropriate Government may, after consultation with the Central Board or, as the case may be, a State Board, prohibit, by notification in the Official Gazette, employment of contract labour in any process, operation of other work in any establishment. (2) Before issuing any notification under sub-section (1) in relation to an establishment, the appropriate Government shall have regard to the conditions of work and benefits provided for the contract labour in that establishment and other relevant factors, such as—

- (a) whether the process, operation or other work is incidental too, or necessary for the industry, trade, business, manufacture or occupation that is carried on in the establishment;
- (b) whether it is of perennial nature, that is to say, it is of sufficient duration having regard to the nature of industry, trade, business, manufacture or occupation carried on in that establishment;
- (c) whether it is done ordinarily through regular workmen in that establishment or an establishment similar thereto ;
- (d) whether it is sufficient to employ considerable number of whole time workmen.”

Mr. P. Deka relied upon his submission on the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Indian Oil Corporation, Assam Vs. Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Assam and others GLR(1999) 2 page 360 and also (1994) 5 SCC Page 304, R. K. Pandey and others Vs. Steel Authority of India and others (1992) 1 SCC Page 695 Dinanath and others Vs. National Fertilizer Ltd. and others (1995) 5 SCC Page 27 Gujarat Electricity Board, Thermal Power Station, Ukai Vs. Hind Mazdoor Sabha and others. Relaying upon their decision, the learned counsel has concurred that the workman being a contract labour under M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates has not approached the appropriate Government i.e. Central Govt. to abolish contract labour by issuing notification under section 10 of the said act, he can not agitate this dispute under the provision of I.D. Act against the management as there is no direct relationship of employer and employee between management and the workmen.

Mr. G. P. Bhowmik, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the workman has submitted that the workman is not a contract labour, but an employee of GAIL at their Silsagar Office and present dispute is not barred by the section 10 of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition Act 1970). This being so present dispute cannot be said to be not maintainable under section 2(K) of the I.D. Act. He relied his submission on (1984) 4 SCC Page 329, where it is held by the Apex Court that reference once validity made by the appropriate Government Tribunal has to adjudicate the dispute on merit. The practice of raising preliminary objection on the point of maintainability is disapproved.

After hearing two learned advocates for both the parties I find that there is substantial question of law to be decided as to be maintainability of this reference. Section 2(K) of the I.D. Act defines the Industrial Disputes as follows :—“Industrial Dispute means any dispute or difference between employers and employees, or between employer and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of employment or with the conditions of labour, of any person.” These definition laid down in section 2(K) of Industrial Dispute Act shows that there must be a dispute or difference between employer and employees or between workmen and employer or between workmen and the workmen. These being so let us see in the instant case whether management is the principal employer of the workmen or not. The materials on record discussed above has established that there is a contract between M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates and GAIL to look after account works at Sibsagar Office at Lakuwa and in compliance of such contract the said firm deployed 4 workmen including present one. Out of 4 workmen, 3 were subsequently absorbed by the GAIL as permanent staff after absorbing necessary formalities, as the present workmen is not found qualified he was not permanency absorbed and so he was withdrawn by the original firm of the workmen. Ext. B, is the letter written to M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates by the GAIL requesting them to depute the workmen to look after the accounts work and ext. C, is the letter written by said firm deploying 4 workmen including present workmen to look after the account work. Ext. E is the letter written by Shri S. Bhowmik to his principal firm seeking leave for his illness and Ext. D is the letter written by M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates firm to the management asking the workman Shri S. Bhowmik and Shri S. Chakravarty to discontinue their work as per telephone instruction received from GAIL. Ext. F is the letter written by said workman to the management for regularises their service and Ext. G is another letter by which workman S. Bhowmik applied for the financial advance from the management. All these documents show that present workmen was employee of M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates firm and he was deployed to GAIL office under the terms of contract and hence his service is governed by the contract labour (Regulation & Abolition Act) 1970. Although the learned counsel of the workman has submitted that the workman S. Bhowmik is not a contract labour through M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates, but direct employee of GAIL, but in para 4 of the written statement he has clearly admitted that he joined in the GAIL as a contract labour through the audit firm of M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates. Apart from that all the document which I have already mentioned above shows that he was deployed by M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates and all correspondence regarding his appointment/withdrawal had been made by said firm. From the perusal of the Ext. ‘B’ letter written by GAIL to M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates requesting them to depute the workman to look after the account work, I have found that remuneration paid to the workman shall be reimbursed by the GAIL office from the contractor’s bill this shows that the monthly remuneration of the workman shall be paid by the GAIL subject to reimbursement from the bill to be submitted by the firm as per terms of contract.

The contention of the workman is that he was authorised by the management vide a letter dated 16-8-95 to bring the amount from Bank is not sufficient to consider him as a direct employee of the GAIL because the GAIL has deputed the workman to bring an amount of Rs. 3000 through cheque No. 982123 as he applied for advance for Rs. 6000 due to his financial hardship subject to reimbursement from his monthly wages, the GAIL allowed him to withdraw Rs. 3000/- instead Rs. 6000/- that he has applied. Apart from that the workman could not show or produce any document like any formal appointment letter issued by the GAIL appointing him as Account Staff or any other document in support of his claim that he is the permanent employee of the GAIL. Although by submitting aforesaid document, the workman has tried to establish that he was a direct employee of the GAIL instead of contract labour, but his own admission in para 4 of the written statement has totally demolished his adventure to establish himself as a direct employee of the GAIL. From the perusal of the oral evidence of both of the parties, I have found that the workman is a contract labour of the management through the M/s. S. K. Barua & Associates and hence his case fall within the provision of contract labour (Regulation & Abolition Act) 1970.

As already mentioned above section 10 of the contract labour (Regulation & Abolition Act) 1970 has laid down a bar in raising industrial dispute without abolition it by appropriate Government by issuing notification. So until and unless contract labour is abolished by the appropriate Government by issuing notification under said section of law, the workman can not agitate the dispute under the provision of I.D. Act as there is no direct relationship of employee and employer to fulfil the condition of section 2(K) of I.D. Act.

In Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (Assam Oil Division) Vs. Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Assam and others GLR (1999)2 page 360. Our Hon’ble High Court has held that absence of relationship of employee and employee-dispute can not be brought within a fold of the definition of the I.D. Act, reference not maintainable. The relevant para is 6 which is reproduced herein below : “From the reference order as reproduced above, it would appear that the purpose of reference was to ascertain from the tribunal whether the action of the Oil Corporation is not regularising the services of 17 contractual workers is justified. The terms of reference itself shows that relationship of employer and employees does not exist between the Indian Oil Corporation and the contractual labourers. The materials placed on record also show that the cause of the contractual labourers has been espoused by the Mineral Workers Union, Digboi and not by the direct employees of the principal employer. As such, in the absence of a relationship of employers and employees, the dispute can not be brought within the fold of definition of ‘Industrial Dispute’ as defined in section 2(K) of the Industrial Disputes Act.”

In Gujarat Electricity Board Vs. Hind Mazdoor Sabha and others, 1995 (5) SCC page 27 Apex Court has held that the authority to abolish the contract labour under section 10 of the contract labour (Regulation and Abolition Act), 1970 vest in the

appropriate Government and not in any court including industrial adjudication, I.D. Act, 1947 section 2(K) and 10. The relevant para of the Judgement is as follows : "In view of the provisions of section 10 of the Act, it is only the appropriate Government which has the authority to abolish genuine labour contract in accordance with the provisions of the said section. No Court including the industrial adjudicator has jurisdiction to do so. (ii) If the contract is a sham or not genuine, the workmen of the so-called contractor can raise an industrial dispute for declaring that they were always the employees of the principal employer and for claiming the appropriate service conditions. When such dispute is raised, it is not a dispute for abolition of the labour contract and hence the provisions of section 10 of the Act will not bar either the raising or the adjudication of the dispute. When such dispute is raised, the industrial adjudicator has to decide whether the contract is a sham or genuine. It is only if the adjudicator comes to the conclusion that the contract is a sham, that he will have jurisdiction to adjudicate the dispute. If, however, he comes to the conclusion that the contract is genuine, he may refer the workmen to the appropriate Government for abolition of the contract labour under section 10 of the Act and keep the dispute pending. However, he can do so if the dispute is espoused by the direct workmen of the principal employer. If the workmen of the principal employer have not espoused the dispute, the adjudicator, after coming to the conclusion that the contract is genuine, has to reject the reference. The dispute being not an industrial dispute within the meaning of section 2(k) of the Industrial Dispute Act. He will not be competent to give any relief to the workmen of the erstwhile contractor even if the labour contract is abolished by the appropriate Government under section 10 of the Act." In Indian Oil Corporation Vs. The Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Gauhati and Others [1992 (2) GLJ Page 2651. Hon'ble High Court had on the subject as follows : "Para-14 : To answer the question referred to the Industrial Tribunal shall have to decide firstly whether the job in the bottling plant of the petitioner-company was of perennial nature and consequently Whether the company was justified in employing a contractor for this purpose. In other words if the Industrial Tribunal comes to the finding that the work was of perennial nature the Tribunal shall have to hold that employing the workmen through a contractor was not justified. Therefore, the finding of the Tribunal would amount to prohibiting employment of contract labour for the LPG plant of the petitioner-company. The power of prohibiting employment of contract labour has been given by the Legislature to the Central Government or the State Government as the case may be and the appropriate Government may by notification prohibit employment of contract labour after consultation with the Central Board or the State Board as the case may be as provided under section 10 of the Act. The appropriate Government shall have to give due regard to the conditions of work and benefits provided for contract labour in the establishment and other relevant factors as provided in sub-section (2) of section 10. One of the relative factor in coming into force of the Act this power of prohibiting employment of contract labour has been given to the Central State Government, as the case

may be, and the decision of the appropriate Government, under the said section shall be final. Therefore, this power cannot be exercised by any other authority including the Industrial Tribunal. It has already been stated that while deciding the reference the Tribunal shall have to come to a finding whether the work in question was of perennial nature and whether employment of contract labour should be prohibited or not. This question can not be decided by the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, the reference in question vide order of the Central Government dated 11-3-1992 vide Annexure-II is bad in law".

In all aforesaid decision the law laid down by the Apex Court and our own High Court show that the contract labour not being abolished by the appropriate Government by issuing notification under section 10 of the said act can not raise any Industrial Dispute as there is no direct relationship between employer and workmen raising any dispute to attack the spirit of I.D. Act. The present workmen apparently being a contract labour by his own admission in his written statement and also others document filed by the management, and hence he can not raise this dispute under the provisions of Industrial Dispute Act. Although learned advocate for the workman has drawn my attention to case law 1994(5) SCC page 392 as has already referred to above, but said decision is not applicable in this case as this case is finally decided on merit after hearing both the parties as per law.

For the forgoing reason I hold that the reference is not maintainable as it is not an Industrial Dispute within the meaning of section 2(K) of the I.D. Act and it is answered accordingly.

I give this award on this the 27th July, 1999 under my hand and seal.

K. SARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1999

कांअ(०2558 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमि. के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण अहमदाबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/2/97-आई.आर. (सी-I)]

श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1999

S.O. 2558.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. ONGC Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-8-99.

[No. L-30012/2/97-IR(C-I)]

S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI P. R. DAVE, PRESIDING
OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(CENTRAL) AT AHMEDABAD.

Complaint (ITC) No. 1 of 1999

IN

Ref. (ITC) No. 21 of 1998

Vaghela Manubhai Ramjibhai,
c/o Gujarat Petroleum Employees Union,
424-46, Gandhivas, Koba Road,
Sabarmati, Ahmedabad-5. . . Complainant

Vs.

1. Public Power Mazdoor Kamdar Sahakari
Madali Ltd., Opposite Dudh Sagar Dairy,
Highway Road, Mehsana.
2. Group General Manager (Project),
ONGC, Avani Bhavan, 5th floor,
Sabarmati, Ahmedabad . . . Complainant

Complaint under Sec. 33 of the I.D. Act, 1947.

AWARD

This complaint under Sec. 33 of the I.D. Act by the above-named complainant Shri Vaghela M. Ramjibhai, Sweeper at ONGC Sabarmati at Ahmedabad, was filed for restraining the Opponents from terminating/discharging (refrenching the services of the complainant). During the course of proceedings the matter was adjourned from time to time in the interest of justice and also to give opportunities to the complainant to defend his case. However, by a pursis Ex. 14 dated 12th July, 1999, the complainant has expressed his unwillingness to proceed with the matter, and as per the request made by the complainant, the complaint is sought to be withdrawn. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

As permission to withdraw this complaint is granted, this complaint application stands disposed off accordingly with no order as to cost.

SECRETARY,

Ahmedabad, 31st July, 1999.

P. R. DAVE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1999

का.अ.त. 2559.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स एच.पी.सी.एल. के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/23/90-आई.आर. (विविध)]

श्याम सुन्दर गुप्ता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1999

S.O. 2559.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. H.P.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-30012/23/90-IR(Misc.)]

S. S. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CGIT/LC(R)/35/91

Shri G. Balasubramanian Iyer,
LIG 127,
New Subash Nagar, Raisen Road,
Bhopal (M.P.) . . . Workman

V/s.

The General Manager (W.Z.) Sales,
Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd.,
Hindustan Bhawan,
8, Murli Vallabhdas Road,
Ballard Estate,
Bombay (M.S) . . . Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 23rd day of July, 1999.

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-30012/23/90-IR MISC. dated 21st November, 1990 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited in termination the services of Shri G. Balasubramanian Iyer, Stenographer w.e.f. 6th July, 1989 is justified. If not, what relief Shri G. Balasubramanian Iyer is entitled?"

2. According to workman Shri G. Balasubramanian Iyer he was appointed a stenographer after interview from 12th May, 1981 by the management. He was confirmed in this post from 20th November, 1981. He was issued Show Cause Notice on 15th July, 1987 alleging that he has forged certificate in order to attain employment. This Show Cause Notice was replied by the workman. After 2 years the services of the workmen were terminated by order 1st June, 1989. The reason given that he has given false information at the time of employment. According to workman the order of termination is bad in law and amounts to retrenchment. This order caused a stigma on the workman without an enquiry. This order is against the provisions of ID Act. The workman wants his reinstatement and payment of back wages and allowances.

3. According to management the workman has occurred an appointment by submitting false documents. The workman thus got employment on false pretext. This was contrary to Clause 10 of the Appointment Letter. The workman told that he has experience of 5 years in stenography and on this understanding he was given employment as stenographer. This fact was false. There are recruitment rules in the management. The workman gave his past experience at the time of appointment and also certificate. It was found that the certificate given by the workman were false and fabricated. A Show Cause Notice was given to the workman on 15-7-87. The workman replied to this notice. This explanation was not found satisfactory and the Corporation terminated the services of workman from 1-6-89. This action is as per rules of management. The management has not committed any breach of provision of I.D. Act. The Bio Data given by the workman is false. The management prays that the termination of the workman be confirmed and the reference be answered in their favour.

4. The management remained absent on 12-8-98, 22-10-98 and 22-1-99. The workman filed his affidavit on 12-8-98. The management was proceeded ex parte on 22-10-98. So far the management has not moved this court to set aside the ex parte order.

5. The workman has filed his affidavit on 12-8-98. He has not been cross-examined on this affidavit. I accept the contention of the affidavit to be true. According to this affidavit he was confirmed to the post of Stenographer from 20-11-81. A Show Cause Notice was given to him on 15-7-87. Alleging that he has given false information to the management about his experience as a stenographer. Further it was alleged he has submitted false certificates.

6. The management should have held a Domestic Enquiry to enquire about all these allegations. Such an enquiry was not held. The management in their written statement has levied charges against the workman which are grave and serious. Such charges will only be levied after due enquiry against the workman. Thus not holding an enquiry on the charges amount to illegality and denial of justice to the workman. The order of termination from service is bad in law.

7. The award is given in favour of the workman. The order of termination is quashed. It will be deemed that the workman is in continuous service from 6-7-89 till date. The workman has not performed work from date of termination till re-employment. He will not be paid wages from 6-7-89 till date of Award. From the date of award the workman would be paid wages and allowances as per rules. Both parties to bear their own costs.

8. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2560.—श्रौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत गोल्ड माइन्स लि० के प्रबन्धकों के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित

श्रौद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रौद्योगिक अधिनियम स-1, मुम्बई के पंखाद को प्रकाशित करना है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-43012/2/93-आर्०आर० (विवाद)]
बी०एम्० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2560.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Gold Mines Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-8-99.

[No. L-43012/2/93-IR (Misc.)]
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated the 10th August, 1999

PRESENT :

Justice R. Ramakrishna, Presiding Officer

C. R. No. 1/94

I PARTY

The Secretary,
Bharat Gold Mines
Employees Union,
Oorgaum,
KOLAR GOLD FIELDS-563 120.

II PARTY

The Managing Director,
GBML,
Oorgaum,
KOLAR GOLD FIELDS-563 120.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2A of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide Order No. L-43012/2/93-IR (Misc.) dated 1-1-94 for adjudication on the following schedule.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action taken by the management of BGML in dismissing Shri Murthy, G. D. Watchman on charges of negligence of duty and abetment of theft is justifiable? If not, to what relief he is entitled?”

2. The II party has passed an Order of dismissal against the I party w.e.f. 10-3-1992 after a Domestic Enquiry was conducted.

3. At the relevant point of time the I party was working as Watchman. He has joined the services of the II party as a General Labourer in the year 1977. He was later assigned the job of Watch and Ward and he was working in that capacity till he was dismissed from service.

4. On 28-3-1991 this workman was on duty in a place called Henry Shaft Yard and the duty timing was from 6.00 p.m. to 2.00 a.m. According to him in petroling he has to cover considerable distance comprising Logo Shed, Stores, First Aid Room, Black Smith Room, Welding Shop etc. At about 11.00 p.m. some miscreants entered and they indulged in committing theft of steel sets and for that purpose they were loading the same in a trolley. This incident being observed by one of the Watchman Balraman and Bansiraman, they have raised the alarm and proceeded to that place. After sometime the I party watchman along with Casual Watchman also came there and they resisted in preventing the commission of theft. The miscreants pelted stones on all these watchmen and after some struggle they have escaped in the darkness. This fact being intimated to G. D. Supervisor. A flying squad was sent and the event that occurred was duly noted. However, the management on the basis of the fact that the I party was not found in the place where an attempt to theft was made, they charged negligence of duty and abetment to the theft, constituted misconducts under standing Orders 20(b)(2) and (34).

5. The workman has denied the charges and he is said that he has also participated in preventing this theft and therefore the allegation of negligence and abetment of theft is totally unwarranted. However the management have conducted the Domestic Enquiry against him. Balram and other watchman who were present in that place were examined. The Enquiry Officer on their evidence came to the conclusion that the allegation of charge was proved. The Disciplinary Authority and the appellate authority inspite of the appeal made by this workman, have not considered his plea and he was dismissed from service.

6. Initially we have asked the II party to prove the validity of Domestic Enquiry. After recording the evidence of Enquiry Officer and the workman we gave a finding that the Domestic Enquiry was conducted in accordance with law.

7. The learned Advocate for the II party has submitted that the I party being a watchman shall safeguard the property of his employer but he has failed to do so. According to the learned Advocate at the time of theft the I party was found absent in that place. Therefore it amounts to negligence of duty and abetment of theft.

8. Against this submission Sr. KAS the learned Advocate for the workman has submitted that though this incident took place, as it can be found in the records, there is absolutely no evidence to prove that the I party was negligent or he has connived or guilty of abetment of theft.

9. I have gone through the report of the Enquiry Officer and the evidence placed by the witnesses who

were present at the time of this incident. Bansiraman SD Watchman 208 gave the evidence that around 10-30 p.m. he closed the Shaft door and after a few minutes the I party came and asked him for fire wood. After that the I party left, within about 5 minutes he heard some movements and then he went to Balraman and informed him about the movements. Then they noticed some 4 to 5 persons were loading a trolley with Steel sets. Immediately they blew their whistles and went there. He has further stated "Shri Murthy also came there alongwith the casual watchman and the miscreants started pelting stones on them and they retaliated by pelting stones on them."

10. The evidence of Balraman is corroborated in the evidence of Bansiraman. He also stated in his evidence "At that time I saw Murthy and Casual Watchman running from the Henry Yard breach towards lecture hall. I saw some people near Manager's Office. I whistled at once and Murthy also whistled. The miscreants started pelting stones on us."

11. The above evidence does not lead to any inference of guilty against the I party workman. The II party have not placed any material that this workman connived with the miscreants and he has abetted theft. His absence for few seconds cannot be viewed it was neglect of duty.

12. The Enquiry Officer failed to take these facts into consideration before he gave a report against this workman. The evidence coupled with pervert appeals made by this workman in the reply statement, before proposed punishment and before appellate authority, clearly demonstrates that all is not well with the management. The II party also independently not established connivance or abatement of theft. There is no evidence of any police complaint or any investigation by the Police.

13. Since the report of the Enquiry Officer is perverse as the Enquiry Officer failed to take into consideration legal evidence placed before him, there is no impediment to hold that the report is passed on nothing but surmises and conjectures.

14. Having regard to these facts and circumstances the II party are not justified in dismissing the service of the I party workman. Consequent to this conclusion the following order is made.

ORDER

15. The Order of dismissal against the I party is hereby set aside. The II party is directed to reinstate this workman into the position he was held before his dismissal. He is entitled for continuity of service, monitory benefits and full back wages from the date of his dismissal till his reinstatement.

16. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the LDC, transcribed by him, corrected and signed by me on 10th August 1999).

JUSTICE R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

not, what relief the employees are entitled to?"

का.सं. 2561 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत गोल्ड माइन्स लि० के प्रबन्धता के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलूर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-43011/1/92-आई०आर० (विविध)]
बी०एम० डेविड, डी०ए० अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2561.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Gold Mines LTD., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-43011/1/92-IR (Misc.)]
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, BANGALORE

Dated : 10th August, 1999

PRESENT:

Justice R. Ramakrishna Presiding Officer.

C.R. No. 12/93

I PARTY

The Secretary,
Bharat Gold Mines Employees
Union,
Oorgaum,
Kolar Gold Fields.

II PARTY

The Managing Director,
Bharat Gold Mines
Limited,
Oorgaum,
Kolar Gold Fields-563 120.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-42011/1/92-IR (Misc.) dated 2-2-93 on the following schedule:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of BGML, KGF is justified in dismissing Sri Sugumaran, PE No. 168079/3 and Sri Sivanesan, PE No. 131751/3 from service for the misconduct of theft allegedly committed by them? If

2. The concerned workman in this dispute, Sri. Sugumaran PE No. 168079/3 and Sri. Shivanesan PE No. 131751/3 were working as a General Labourers (Underground) in the mines of the II party.

3. On 28-3-89 at about 3 p.m. these workmen were working at 93/94 level of Osborne shaft. A detective party consisting of Sri Jaikishan, Bihari Ram, Harphool and Murthy came to that place and alleged to have been found that these two workmen were in the act of holding gunny bag containing GBO powder in small peices. These workmen have seen these detective party, said to have been threw the gunny bag and tried to escape by climbing in a ladder way. They have been caught and a police complaint was given and they are being handed over to the Police. A departmental enquiry was also initiated and after the enquiry, on the report of the Enquiry Officer, the management ordered dismissal from service of these two workmen.

4. The workmen in their claim statement have challenged each and every circumstances of the case made out by the management, and they have contended that they were busy in their work but the detective party have foisted a false case against them. Their other contention is that in a criminal case registered against them in CC No. 1203/89, the learned principal Judicial Magistrate has acquitted them of the charges levelled against him. This order was passed on 26-6-93. However, they have questioned the validity of Domestic Enquiry and also the order of punishment imposed against them. This Tribunal initially decided the question of validity of Domestic Enquiry in favour of the management after giving opportunity to both parties, to lead their evidence.

5. The learned advocate for the II party has contended that the allegation of theft was proved and the said allegation is a very serious offence and therefore, the order of dismissal does not call for any interference. The learned Advocate further submitted that a mere fact that these workmen were acquitted in a criminal case does not take away the right of the management to conduct a Domestic Enquiry and give punishment on the basis of the report.

6. Sri. KVS, the learned Advocate for the workmen has submitted, that the very allegations contained in the charge sheet does not lead to a presumption that the I party were even committing theft of the property belongs to the II party and secondly these workmen being honourable acquitted by a competent criminal Court, this fact should have been taken into consideration in deciding this dispute.

7. A show cause notice issued to these workmen as follows:

"It is reported that you have indulged in theft of employer's property is that on 28-3-1989 at about 3.00 p.m. at 93-94 level of Osborne shaft. South Stope Drive (working man-hole), the detective party consisting of Sri Jaikishan, SD Watchman No. 420, Bihari Ram, SD Watchman No. 238, Harphool, SD Watchman No. 402 and Murthy,

GD Watchman No. 140 noticed through the working manhole that you were filling a gunny bag with GBQ along with Shri Sivanesan, P.E. No. 131751/3, Mason.

Further immediately Shri Jaikishan, SD Watchman No. 420, along with Shri Murthy GD Watchman No. 140, went down through the rope ladder without light. Sooner they came down, they noticed you were holding a gunny bag containing GBQ powder [small pieces and you tried to throw away the contents. When Sri Jaikishan, SD Watchman No. 420 caught hold of you, then you pushed him away and escaped by climbing the ladder by leaving the said bag, but later caught at the top of the manhole by the detectives."

8. The I party workman Mr. Sugumaran, in his reply to the show cause notice, has stated as follows:

"I write to state that on 28-3-89 I came to 1st shift and was allocated to 93-94 Osborne Shaft South stops Drive to work as Blaster Assistant to Mate Murugan.

Accordingly I went to work to 93-94 C/S Stop Drive and loaded 9 drilled holes out of 12 holes. The balance of 3 holes was not able to trace it out by us, then our Mate Sri. Murugan, came to up and sent down Sri Sivanesan and instructed him to trace out the drilled 3 holes by using the slack rods. When Sri Sivanesan came down with slack rod, we were cleaning the holes, after cleaning the holes (all 3 holes) he sent me to call the Mate to come and to load the left 3 drilled holes for Blasting. Accordingly I was climbing the ladder and covered a distance of 10-12 feet then the detective was coming down by prevented me not to go further and asked me get down, I got down to the spot and the Mate also was with the detective. The detective showed the one empty gunny bag to the Mate. The Mate replied that the gunny bag is used for machine it was wet also, but the detective said if the Foreman says your statement is correct I will leave the bag and go away. The mate went and called the foreman and we also came up to the level. Further we don't know what had happened. In the meanwhile two Punjabis went down to the level.

Therefore, I am earnestly requesting you that the charges made against me by the security department is injustice and kindly consider favourable and me to work and oblige."

9. The management have examined 8 witnesses to prove the misconduct of theft against these workmen. Out of this 4 witnesses are from detective party.

10. I have gone through the evidence recorded before the Enquiry Officer with a view to find out what type of evidence relied by the Enquiry Officer to give a finding of guilty when admittedly the very same witnesses are examined before the Criminal Court. Where their evidence was not accepted. Except the evidence of detective party the other evidence of Meganathan and Moses Schum does not help the case of the management. In fact they have informed the detective party that the blasting has been taking place

and they shall not go. In fact it is stated that the gunny bags were usually used to put on the machines in the underground to protect from dust.

11. It is true that the evidence in a Domestic Enquiry would be held in the presence of Enquiry Officer. In this company the standing order has not provided for engaging a Presiding Officer as a conditions. Therefore, witnesses may repeat the statements given by them earlier in the enquiry or they may be questioned by the Enquiry Officer. We should not forget for a moment that an element of interestedness of the Enquiry Officer and other witnesses cannot be ruled out. Therefore, if such a contingency arises there cannot be any impediment to take into consideration of a judgement passed by the Criminal Court on the identical charges and circumstances. We cannot simply brush aside to consider the judgement of a criminal court merely because in a Domestic Enquiry a finding was given against the workmen. If there is no criminal case and misconduct is proved only by conducting a Domestic Enquiry, the things would be different. The appreciation of evidence in these two areas of jurisdiction is to be appreciated when the same set of facts and circumstances arises. The court cannot simply fold their hand and ignore the judgement of competent court on the same fact and circumstances. In fact the very charge is vague and cannot be deciphered legally. If a person was caught red handed while carrying an article alleged to have been stolen by him, it is altogether a different case. It is undisputed that every workmen in this mines shall be subjected to a thorough search before leaving the mines, by efficient watch and ward personnel. If an allegation is made that these workmen were indulged in filling up a gunny bag of GBQ pieces, the obvious question is, how they will carry such gunny bag from mines to outside when there is only one egress which is through watch and ward gate. Therefore, the very charge that they are indulged in committing theft is absurd.

12. Now I come to the question to what extent the tribunal can appreciate when parallel proceedings were initiated by the management, one in the form of Domestic Enquiry and another by giving complaint to the Police and thereby moving the Criminal law into motion. It is true that it is uniform with slight differences that the management can initiate Domestic Enquiry and also give a Police complaint.

13. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in similar circumstances gave the benefit in favour of the workman. In *cap. M. Paul Anthony v/s. Bharat Gold Mines Ltd.* 1999 1 LLJ 1094 (SC) the concerned workman who found to be in position of sponge gold ball and gold bearing sand in his house was prosecuted on the complaint of Superintendent of Police and a Domestic Enquiry also conducted. Of course the Supreme Court taking into consideration non-payment of subsistence allowance, sickness of the workman and the enquiry being conducted at Kolar Gold Fields estate have accepted the judgement of the Criminal court which has acquitted the workman on the charges which are similar that was taken in the Domestic Enquiry. After considering the judgements referred in *Delhi Cloth & General Mills Ltd. v/s. Kushal Bhan* (1960 1 LLJ 520), *Tata Oil Mills Company Ltd., v/s. Workmen* (1964 11 LLJ 113), *Jang Bahadur Singh v/s. Baij Nath* (1969

I LLJ 567), Kusheshwar Debey v/s. M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. and Ors. (II LLJ 470) Nelson Motis v/s. Union of India & Ors. 9(192 II LLJ 744) and some other judgements their Lordships have reached the conclusions which are as follows :

- (i) Departmental proceedings and proceedings in a criminal case can proceed simultaneously as there is no bar in their being conducted simultaneously, though separately.
- (ii) If the departmental proceedings and the criminal case are based on identical and similar set of facts and the charge in the criminal case against the delinquent employee is of a grave nature which involves complicated questions of law and fact it would be desirable to stay the departmental proceedings till the conclusion of the criminal case.
- (iii) Whether the nature of a charge in a criminal case is grave and whether complicated questions of fact and law are involved in that case, will depend upon the nature of offence, the nature of the case launched against the employee on the basis of evidence and materials collected against him during investigation or as reflected in the charge sheet.
- (iv) The factors mentioned at (ii) and (iii) above cannot be considered in isolation to stay the Departmental proceedings but due regard has to be given to the fact that the departmental proceedings cannot be unduly delayed.
- (v) If the criminal case does not proceed or its disposal is being unduly delayed, the departmental proceedings, even if they were stayed on account of the pendency of the criminal case, can be resumed and proceeded with, so as to conclude them at an early date so that if the employee is found not guilty his honour may be vindicated and in case he is found guilty, administration may get rid of him at the earliest.

14. The law enunciated by the various judgements narrated supra, are on the basis of the facts and circumstances of that particular case. There is a small demarcation line exist between these two parallel jurisdiction as it relates to Domestic Enquiry and launching of a criminal case. Some how the courts are reluctant to come to open mind in distinguishing these two jurisdiction, possibly with a feeling that an expression in one area may affect the jurisdiction of other area. When such a predicament occurs, in all fairness, the court shall accept a verdict given by a competent court of jurisdiction. One cannot simply say that a judgement rendered in a Criminal case was made without any application of mind. It should be noted that these courts are manned by responsible Judges who have been trained with a sound legal background. Therefore I am afraid that the courts or tribunals shall not feel shy to accept the verdict of a competent court against the findings in a Domestic Enquiry.

15. After all a workman has been pushed to face a Domestic Enquiry and then a criminal court. As a matter of fact he cannot openly

reveal his defence in one of the forum, as such revelation may affect his defence in the another case. If management had no confidence they shall not report to give a Police complaint on the allegation of theft if they feel that they themselves decide the issue deemed it as a misconduct. Once they move the criminal law into motion, they shall be abided by that judgement. The judgement of the Criminal courts invariably does not challenge in any appeal and therefore, their verdict is binding to all the parties concerned. Once a criminal court declares that a person is innocent of the charges levelled against him the management are not justify to rely on the finding of a Domestic Enquiry, which everyone knows, that an element of interestedness is always present in a Domestic Enquiry. Therefore, I am of the clear view that the verdict of a competent Criminal court is binding to the management and they shall honour such verdict. There cannot be any impediment for the management to restore the job to this workman when the criminal court gave a finding in favour of the accused workman.

16. Having regard to these facts and circumstances, the order of dismissal made by the II party against these workmen are legally not justified. Therefore, I make the following Order:

ORDER

17. The Order of the II party in dismissing the services of these workmen on the alleged misconduct of theft is not justified. Consequent to this finding, the concerned workmen are entitled for reinstatement and continuity of service. Taking into consideration the financial constraints, the II party is facing. I Order the payment of backwages of 50%, from the date of dismissal till their reinstatement.

18. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the LDC, transcribed by him, corrected and signed by me on 10th August 1999).

JUSTICE R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

कां.अ. 2562.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत गोल्ड माईन्स लि० के प्रबंधन के संयुक्त नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलूर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[नं० एल-43012/13/95-आई०आर० (विधि)]

बी०एस० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2562.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th August, 1999.

[No. L-43012/13/95-IR(Misc.)]
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT: BANGALORE
DATED: 10-8-99

PRESENT:

JUDGE R. RAMAKRISHNA

RESIDING OFFICER

C.R. No. 91/97

I PARTY

Mrs. Sofia Rahaman,
Rep. by the President,
Bharat Gold Miners' Assn.,
545, Opp. Punjabi Qtrs.,

OORGAUM P.O., K.G.F.

II PARTY

M/s. Bharat Gold Mines Ltd.,
Rep. by its Managing Director,
Suvannabhavan,
OORGAUM P.O.,

K.G.F.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2A of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-43012/13 95-IR (Misc.) dated 4-1-1996 on the following schedule:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Bharat Gold Mines limited is justified in dismissing Mrs. Sofia Rahaman, Sr. Sister of BGML Medical establishment from services with effect from 28-9-1993 for ever staying the leave by 18 days? If not, what relief she is entitled to and from which date?"

2. Mrs. Sofia Rahaman was appointed as a nurse in BGML Medical Establishment on 25-6-67. She has put up more than 26 years of service. At the time of her dismissal dated 28-9-93 she was working as a Sr. Sister 'B' grade staff nurse.

3. She availed privileged leave from 24-5-93 to 11-6-93. During her relief period she developed a desire to visit the holy place Mecca. Therefore, she has sent a leave letter dated 28-5-93 addressed to the CMO requesting grant of 4 months leave without pay from 12-6-93 to 11-10-93.

4. Meanwhile the second party taken into consideration the absence of the first party from 12-6-93 to 30-6-93, has issued a charge sheet dated 7-7-93 informing that her absence from 12-6-93 to 30-6-93 is a mis-conduct under standing order No. 20(b)(1). She was asked to give her explanation within 7 days. Since the management has not received any reply, it was decided to conduct a domestic enquiry into that effect. A communication was made as per Ex.MI(b) dated 3-8-93. In this notice the date of enquiry was fixed on 12-8-93.

5. The first party though acknowledged the receipt of the charge sheet Ex.MI(a) and the notice of enquiry Ex. MI(b). She was not attended the enquiry. The Enquiry Officer commenced the enquiry on 12-8-93. Having noticed the absence of the first party he has allowed the two witnesses for the management to give their evidence. On recording the evidence in the form of statement and considering their report that the first party is continuously absent from 12-6-93 till 12-8-93 has given a finding that the charges under standing order was proved. The disciplinary authority issued a show cause notice Ex.MI(f) proposing the punishment of dismissal from service. The first party has sent a reply Ex.MI(g), through which she has made a reference of her earlier leave application, from 13-6-93 to 12-9-93 that she will join the duty after 12-10-93. The disciplinary authority being not satisfied with the said reply has passed an order of dismissal with immediate effect as per Ex.MI(h) dated 28-9-93.

6. The first party has developed the case as narrated above. The second party in their counter statement have justified 2564 GI/99-25.

their action and according to them the first party has remained absent unauthorisedly from 12-6-93 onwards and therefore, the management exercising their power under relevant standing orders, conducted a domestic enquiry, and having found that the first party has not given any satisfactory reply to the show cause notice and she is also not attended the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer has passed an order which was accepted by the disciplinary authority. A contention also raised that the first party was working in gulf countries. Of course this has no basis.

7. Initially we have given a finding on the validity of domestic enquiry. The first party accepted the fact that she has not replied to the charge sheet. She denied having received the enquiry notice as contended by the second party. We have also taken into consideration the evidence of the Enquiry Officer, and since the first party has not placed a satisfactory material for her to remain absent for the enquiry, we gave a finding in favour of the management with reference to the validity of domestic enquiry.

8. Shri KSN, the learned advocate for the first party has submitted that the second party are not justified in dismissing the services of the first party wholly on the basis of over stayed leave, according to them, and the management would have given a lighter punishment other than the order of dismissal. Against this submission a learned advocate for the second party has contended that the mis-conduct being proved it is the prerogative of the management to impose the punishment deems fit and therefore, there cannot be any interference to the said order.

9. The law is well settled that any punishment imposed to a workman should always depended on the gravity of the misconduct. While imposing major punishment the disciplinary authority shall take into consideration the unblemished services rendered by the workman, the previous conduct if any and thereafter the gravity of the misconduct proved in the enquiry should be taken into consideration. A disciplinary authority cannot close its eye and accept the report of the enquiry officer without examining the defence taken by a workman even after a report is made.

10. Under standing order No. 20, the various misconducts are enumerated. In this category 'absence without permission' considered to be a mis-conduct under Clause 20(b) sub-Clause (1). The mis-conduct runs from Sl. No. 1 to 41. In the standing orders they have not shown major and minor mis-conducts. The penalties that may be imposed is shown under standing order 20(a). They are as follows:-

1. Censure or warning.
2. Fine subject to the provisions of the payment of wages Act, 1936.
3. Suspension without wages for a period not exceeding 4 days.
4. Stoppage of increment.
5. Reduction to a lower grade of post or lower stage in a time-scale.
6. Removal from service which does not disqualify for future employment.
7. Dismissal from service without notice or any compensation in lieu of notice.

11. The act of misconduct except the one alleged against the 1 party, all other misconducts from Sl. No. 2 to 39 are very grave in nature. Therefore, the order of dismissal is unwarranted in this case, though the 1 party has not participated in the Domestic Enquiry.

12. There is another reason for the above conclusion is that the 1 party had unblemished services from her joining to the duty till she remained absent. In the year 1992 a Certificate of merit was given to her as a best nurse now marked as Ex.C-1. On 24-9-92 a certificate was given to her commending her work as a Staff nurse not only that it is stated that she is quite efficient but sincere and punctual in her work. Her administrative capacities also highlighted in this certificate marked as Ex.C-2. Some more certificate are found in the record and it is not necessary to advert to them.

13. The I party was on leave from 24-5-93 to 12-6-93. On 28-5-93, she sent a leave letter to the CMO as per Ex. W-2, when she developed a desire to visit the holy Mecca and therefore, she shall be granted a months leave from 13-6-93 to 12-10-93. This was sent to the Chief Medical Officer under certificate of posting as per Ex. W-3. In fact the management by their letter dated 29-6-92 marked as Ex.C-3 have certified that they have no objection to obtain a passport to go on pilgrimage by the I party. This clearly established that she has sent the leave letter Ex. W-2 for grant of 4 months leave without pay for this purpose.

14. What we wanted to highlight here is that the I party was genuinely believed that she will be allowed to have a pilgrimage by granting the leave and also due to the fact that she has obtained no objection from the personnel department to obtain a passport for the purpose of pilgrimage. Therefore, when second show cause notice was issued, the I party sent a reply highlighting her previous leave application and also requested the disciplinary authority that she will report to the duty after 12-10-93. Unfortunately the Disciplinary Authority has acted in haste and passed an order of dismissal w.e.f. 28-9-93.

15. Admittedly the Chief Medical Officer has not informed the I party about granting or not granting of leave of Ex. M-I(g). Of course the I party cannot take in granted that by sending a leave letter she can remain absent on that basis. But we must examine the facts and circumstances of a case which is peculiar to it and cannot enlarge the scope for an alleged misconduct. In fact to cure a situation of this nature the legislatures in their wisdom have accepted a celebrated judgement of His Lordship Justice Thakkar, Chief Justice of Gujarat High Court, a reverted memory and then introduced section 11A in the Act.

16. Before awarding a major punishment, the authorities concerned should always examine the gravity of the misconduct, good services rendered by the delinquent and the impact of punishment to an individual. This fact has been highlighted in Scooter India Ltd. v/s. Labour Court by the Supreme Court in AIR 1989 SC 149.

17. Having regard to these facts and circumstances, this Tribunal is not inclined to accept the submissions made by the II party in justifying the order of dismissal.

18. Having regard to these facts and circumstances, the following order is made :

19. The II party has not justified in dismissing the services of the I party workman. Consequent to this finding the following order is made :

ORDER

20. The II party is directed to reinstate the I party to the post she held prior to the order of dismissal. However, taking into consideration, the financial constraints the II party is facing, we order payment of 50% back wages from the date of her dismissal till her reinstatement. She is also entitled for continuity of service.

21. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the LDC, transcribed by him, corrected and signed by me on 10-8-99)

JUSTICE R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2563.—श्री औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री दिलीप कुमार मोती लाल सराफ, लाईम स्टोन, खदान मालिक के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था

[सं० एल-29011/13/97-आई०आर० (विविध)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2563.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Delip Kumar Moti Lal Lime Stone Khadan Owner and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the

[No. L-29011/13/97-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

न्यायधीन, औद्योगिक न्यायिकरण/केन्द्रीय/कोटा/राज/निर्देश प्रकरण क्रमांक : श्री०न्या (केन्द्रीय)-24/97

दिनांक स्थापित : 21-11-97

प्रसंग : भारत सरकार ; श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के आदेश सं० एल० 29011/13/97-आई०आर० (विविध) दिनांक 30-7-97

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

मध्य

मंत्री, राष्ट्रीय मजदूर संघ (इन्टक) रामगंज मण्डी जिला कोटा

—प्रार्थी यूनियन

एवं

दिलीप कुमार मोतीलाल सराफ, लाईम स्टोन खदान मालिक, मु०पो० बाजार नं० 1 रामगंज मण्डी जिला कोटा ।

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थित

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा,

आर०एच०के०एस०

प्रार्थी यूनियन की ओर से प्रतिनिधि :—

श्री सतीश पचौरी

प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि :—

श्री डी०सी० जैन

एवं श्री तेजमल

सराफ

अधिनिर्णय दिनांक : 9-6-99

अधिनिर्णय

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा निम्न निर्देश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (जिसे तदुपरान्त "अधिनियम" से सम्बोधित किया जावेगा) की धारा 10(1)(घ) के अन्तर्गत इस न्यायाधिकरण को अधिनिर्णयार्थ सम्प्रेषित किया गया है :—

"क्या राष्ट्रीय मजदूर संघ (इन्टक), रामगंज मण्डी द्वारा प्रबन्धन दिलीप कुमार मोतीलाल सराफ, लाईम स्टोन खान मालिक के चैट मु० रामगंज मण्डी जिला कोटा से उसकी खान में कार्यरत कर्मचारियों के लिए वित्तीय वर्ष 1995-96 के लिए 20 प्रतिशत बोनस भुगतान करने की मांग उचित एवं न्यायसंगत है ? यदि हां तो संबंधित कर्मकार कितने प्रतिशत बोनस के हकदार हैं ?"

2. निर्देश न्यायाधिकरण में प्राप्त होने पर दर्ज रजिस्टर किया गया व पक्षकारों को सूचना जारी की गयी। प्रार्थी यूनियन के मंत्री द्वारा श्रमिकगण के सम्बन्ध में क्लेम स्टेटमेन्ट प्रस्तुत किया गया तथा यह पत्रावली प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के जवाब के लिए निश्चय रही।

3. आज इस प्रकरण में प्रार्थी यूनियन के मंत्री श्री रामगोपाल गुप्ता मय प्रतिनिधि श्री सतीश पचौरी व प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक पक्ष की ओर से श्री तेजमल सराफ मय प्रतिनिधि श्री डी०सी० जैन ने उपस्थित होकर एक संयुक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के साथ समझौता-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर यह निवेदन किया कि प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में दोनों पक्षों के मध्य लोक न्यायालय की भावना से प्रेरित होकर आपसी समझौता सम्पन्न हो गया है और अब इस समझौते के उपरान्त कोई विवाद शेष नहीं रहा है, अतः प्रस्तुत शुद्धा समझौते के आधार पर अधिनिर्णय पारित कर दिया जावे। प्रस्तुतशुद्धा समझौते-पत्र के अनुसार समझौते के शर्तें निम्न प्रकार से रही हैं:—

- “(1) यह कि पक्षकार सहमत हैं कि उक्त विवाद को औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण, कोटा में लोक अशालत की भावना से हुए समझौते के अनुसार नो डिस्प्यूट अवार्ड के बाबत आवेदन प्रस्तुत करेंगे।
- (2) कि प्रबन्धक प्रतिनिधि ने स्वीकार किया है कि लेखा वर्ष 1995-96 (1 अप्रैल-95 से 31 मार्च-1996 तक के लिए हमारे संस्थान में कार्यरत श्रमिकों/कर्मचारियों को 12 प्रतिशत) (वारह प्रतिशत) की दर से बोनस का भुगतान दि० 15 जुलाई, 99 तक कर दिया जावेगा।
- (3) कि प्रबन्धक प्रतिनिधि ने स्वीकार किया है कि बोनस का भुगतान बोनस अधिनियम सन् 1965 के नियमानुसार किया जावेगा।
- (4) दोनों पक्षों ने स्वीकार किया कि बोनस भुगतान यूनियन प्रतिनिधि के समक्ष कर दिया जावेगा।
- (5) इस विवाद में अन्य कोई विन्दु शेष नहीं रहा है।”

4. प्रस्तुत शुद्धा उक्त समझौते-पत्र को दोनों पक्षों को पढ़कर सुनाया व समझाया गया जो दोनों पक्षों ने मही होना स्वीकार किया तदुपरान्त समझौता तस्दीक कर अभिलेख पर लिया गया। न्यायाधिकरण द्वारा भी प्रस्तुतशुद्धा समझौते का अश्लोकन किया गया जो दोनों पक्षों के हित में प्रतीत होता है। इस प्रकार चूंकि प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में सन्दिग्ध निर्देश विवाद के सम्बन्ध में दोनों पक्षों के मध्य लोक न्यायालय की भावना से प्रेरित हो उपरोक्त प्रकार से समझौता सम्पन्न हो गया है और अब समझौते के उपरान्त किसी प्रकार का कोई विवाद शेष नहीं रहा है, अतः उक्त समझौते के आधार पर इसी प्रकार अधिनिर्णय पारित किया जाता है।

इस अधिनिर्णय का समुचित सरकार को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाया जावे।

जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2564. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पी०सी० बांगड भाईन्स मिनरल् प्रा० लि० के प्रबन्ध-तंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-29012/36/94-आई०आर० (विविध)]
बी०एम० डेविड, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2564.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. P. C. Bengur Mines Minerals Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-8-99.

[No. L-29012/36/94-IR(M)]
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

—न्यायाधीश, औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण/केन्द्रीय/कोटा राजस्थान
निर्देश प्रकरण क्रमांक: श्रौ०न्या०/केन्द्रीय/-16/94

दिनांक स्थापित: 6-12-94

प्रसंग: भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के आवेदन
संख्या एल० 29012/36/94 आई०आर० (विविध)
दिनांक 25-11-94

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

मध्य

बलराम द्वारा मंत्री, राष्ट्रीय मजदूर संघ, रामगंजमण्डी,
कोटा।

—प्रार्थी श्रमिक

एवं

प्रबन्धक, म०पी०सी० बांगड भाईन्स मिनरल् प्रा० लि०
आईमस्टोन खान, चेचट तह० रामगंजमण्डी जिला कोटा।

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थित

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा,
आर०एच०जे०एस०

प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि:—

श्री बलराम
(स्वयं श्रमिक)

प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि:—

श्री डी०सी० जैन
एवं श्री एस०ए०
भकुट्टी

अधिनिर्णय दिनांक: 28-6-99

अधिनियम

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

भारत सरकार, अधीनस्थ, नई दिल्ली द्वारा निम्न निर्देश अधिनियम अधिनियम, 1947 (जिसे तदुपरांत "अधिनियम" के अन्तर्गत किया जाएगा) की धारा 10(1) (घ) के अन्तर्गत इस अधिनियम को अधिनियमित करने के लिए प्रस्तावित है :—

"क्या प्रबंधन मैसर्स पी.सी. बांगड, माईन्स मिनरल्स प्रा. लि. द्वारा कर्मकार श्री बनराम पुत्र श्री रामलाल मेवताल हेल्पर को दि० 25-3-93 से ड्यूटी पर न लेने एवं उसकी सेवाएं समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही वैधानिक एवं उचित है ? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुक्रम का हकदार है ?"

2. निर्देश न्यायाधिकरण से प्राप्त होने पर वर्ज रजिस्टर किया गया व पक्षकारों को सूचना जारी की गयी। पक्षकारों की ओर से आने-आने अध्यावेदन प्रस्तुत किये गये तथा प्रार्थी श्रमिक पक्ष की ओर से आता अपयन्त्र प्रस्तुत किया गया तथा पक्षावली प्रतिपरीक्षा हेतु नियत रही।

3. आश स्वयं प्रार्थी बनराम व प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से एस.एम. कुट्टी मय अधिकृत प्रतिनिधि श्री टी.सी. जैन ने उपस्थित होकर एक संयुक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के साथ समझौता-पत्र व राशि प्राप्ति रसीद की फोटोप्रति प्रस्तुत कर यह निवेदन किया कि चूंकि दोनों पक्षों के मध्य प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में लोक न्यायालय की भावना से प्रेरित होकर आपसी समझौता सम्पन्न हो गया है, अतः समझौते के आधार पर अधिनियम पारित कर दिया जावे।

4. प्रस्तुतगुदा समझौते-पत्र के अनुसार प्रार्थी श्रमिक को प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा दि० 1-6-94 में ही सेवा की निरन्तरता प्रदान करते हुए पुनः ड्यूटी पर लेना स्वीकार किया गया है तथा दि० 25-3-93 से 31-5-94 तक के मुआवजे के रूप में 7,500/- रु० का भुगतान भी प्रार्थी श्रमिक को अदा कर दिया गया है जिसके कि पुष्टिस्वरूप स्वयं प्रार्थी की हस्ताक्षरित रसीद की प्रमाणित प्रति भी समझौते-पत्र के साथ संलग्न की गयी है जिसके कि तहत 7,500/- रु० प्रार्थी को प्राप्त हुए हैं। पक्षकारों को उक्त प्रकार से प्रस्तुतगुदा समझौता पत्र पढ़कर सुनाया गया व समझाया गया जिससे दोनों पक्षों ने सही होना स्वीकार किया तथा न्यायाधिकरण द्वारा भी समझौते का अवलोकन किया जो दोनों पक्षों के हित में प्रतीत होता है तथा दोनों पक्ष प्रस्तुतगुदा समझौते से सम्मत् रहेंगे। इस प्रकार चूंकि दोनों पक्षों के मध्य लोक न्यायालय की भावना से प्रेरित होकर उक्त प्रकार से आपसी समझौता सम्पन्न हो गया है और समझौते उपरान्त प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में अब कोई विवाद शेष नहीं रहा है, अतः समझौते के आधार पर इसी प्रकार अधिनियम पारित किया जाना है।

इस अधिनियम को समुचित सरकार को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ प्रिज्जवाया जावे।

जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा, न्यायाधीन

का०आ० 2565.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार माईसौर मिनरल्स लि० के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलौर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-29012/54/93-आई०आर० (विधि)]

बी० एस० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2565.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mysore Minerals Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-8-99.

[No. L-29012/54/93-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, BANGALORE

Dated, the 2nd August, 1999

PRESENT :

Justice R. Ramakrishna, Presiding Officer.

C. R. No. 85/1994

I PARTY

Doreswamy,
Represented by the General
Secretary,
Mysore Minerals Limited
Employees Union,
No. 39, M. G. Road,
Bangalore-560 001.

II PARTY

The Managing Director,
Mysore Minerals Limited,
No. 39, M. G. Road,
Bangalore-650 001.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2A of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-29012/54/93-IR (Misc.) dated 3-10-94 on the following schedule.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Mysore Minerals Ltd., is justified in terminating the services of Shri Doreswamy, a chiselman? If not, to what relief he is entitled to?"

2. The first party workman was appointed as a Chiselman in the year 1985 to do the works of Granite Cutting and polishing in a unit situated at Hassan. He was transferred to a place called Chamarajanagar, Mysore District w.e.f. 8-6-1991. On reporting to duty the I party has worked for few months and then remained absent unauthorisedly w.e.f. 12-10-91. His absence caused dislocation of works. Therefore, the second party has issued a notice dated 12-10-91 directing him to report for duty immediately. In spite of this notice having received the I party neither reported for duty nor sent any written explanation for his unauthorised absence. Therefore, the second party are obliged to send two more notices dated 2-12-91 and 18-12-91 by RPAD to his known address. These notices are returned unserved. Therefore the second party decided to conduct an enquiry and sent a notice dated 2-1-92. This notice also not served. Therefore, an Enquiry Officer was asked to look into this unauthorised absence, who gave a report Ex. M5 against the workman. The II party accepted the said report and issued an order of dismissal dated 20-3-1992 w.e.f. 18-1-92.

3. The workman appears to have contacted the second party on 8-8-92 to take him for duty on the ground he was taking continuous treatment due to some ailments. The second party have not accepted the contention of the first party. Thereafter the I party raised an Industrial Dispute.

4. The I party in his claim statement has contented that on 12-10-91 due to Cauvery Water Dispute he has been assaulted by a mob of people and he has returned to Hassan on the very same day. Thereafter he fell sick and took treatment in various place till 8-3-92.

5. He raised the contention that his removal from service amounts to retrenchment and therefore, the second party having failed to comply with mandatory provisions contained under Section 25F of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947, his dismissal is non-sustainable under law.

6. The second party in their counter statement have disputed each and every contentions raised by the first party to show that he was not under unauthorised absence. They have contented that since this workman has not sent any communication giving reasons for his absence, the II party have issued necessary notices, as contemplated under law. Since the I party failed to send any communication of whatever means they have dismissed him from service in accordance with rules and therefore, he is not entitled for any relief in this dispute. They have further contented that his removal after enquiry does not attract the provisions of Section 25F of the Act.

7. On the basis of the above pleadings we have framed some additional issues to consider along with the merits of the case. They are as follows :—

- (1) Whether the II party proves that the first party deliberately remained absent and the notice of enquiry could not be served?
- (2) Whether the I party proves that his absence from 12-10-91 to 8-8-92 was not deliberate but for the reasons stated at para 4 of the claim statement.
- (3) Whether the I party has proved that he approached the II party on 8-8-92 with due representation and medical certificates?

8. We are not intended to have a discussion on the above issues independently in view of the fact that the above issues are inter-connected. The answers to those issues will decide the very dispute as shown in the schedule to the reference.

9. It is admitted of no doubt that the evidence of MW-1 a representative of the second party shows that this workman after his transfer to Chamarajanagar was remained absent from 12-10-91 continuously. It is also proved that he has not sent any communication to the II party giving reasons for his absence except the fact that he appeared before them on 8-8-92, for the first time after his unauthorised absence. He tried to justify his absence on medical grounds by producing some medical certificates, said to have been issued in his favour by some doctors.

10. On the contrary the II party has took note of his absence without any information and therefore, they have sent a memo dated 16-11-91 advising the first party to report for duty within 10 days failing which necessary action will be initiated. The I party received this letter as per the acknowledgement Ex. M1(a). He did not report for duty nor sent any communication. Therefore, a second and 3rd notice was issued dated 3-12-91 and 18-12-91 respectively. Though the letters are addressed to an address shown in Ex. M1, but these notices are returned unserved with a postal Sharah that the party was found absent always. The second party once again issued a notice Ex. M4 dated 2-1-92 that an enquiry will be conducted against him on 18-1-92 and he shall attend the enquiry. Of course they have no evidence whether this notice is served though the address given was to the notice is same given in Ex. M1. The Enquiry Officer having found the absence of the first party in the enquiry gave finding that necessary action under law shall be taken for his unauthorised absence. Thereafter the second party passed an order of removal as per Ex. M6.

11. Contrary to this material, the contention of this workman is that he has been man-handled at Chamarajanagar by a group of persons in respect of an agitation on Cauvery Water dispute. Therefore, he has returned immediately to Hassan. He has not established this fact by any acceptable material if such an event took place, the first and foremost duty of any person is to inform his officers or the police authorities. After his return he will not send any communication to the second party why he is returned from Chamarajanagar. Therefore, the workman, initially, not proved that his return from Chamaraja-

nagar was due to the reasons given by him. With regard to the treatment, he has produced some medical certificates. Ext. W1 is a certificate issued by Primary Health Centre, Shanthigram certifying that he is suffering from Intestinal Amastris w.e.f. 13-10-91 to 27-11-91. The next certificate is Ex. W2 issued by Asstt. Surgeon, Jayachamarajendra hospital, Hassan certified he was suffering from infectious Hepatitis and took treatment as a out patient. Ex. W3 is a certificate again issued by PHC, Arisikere that he is suffering from 107 days.

12. Prima facie these certificates are not proved. These certificates are fabricated only for the purpose of this case and nothing else. Therefore, we cannot find fault with the II party in removing him from service when the first party deliberately and intentionally remained absent from duty.

13. The learned advocate for the first party has submitted that the termination of the service by giving one month notice of three months notice is not permissible. To substantiate this submission the learned advocate relied on a case in Upton India Ltd. V/s. Annibha, AIR 1998 SC page 1861.

14. In this case their lordships of the Supreme Court were examining a case of over staying on leave and the action of the management in relying on a provision of automatic termination of service due to over staying on leave. Their lordships have held that automatic termination of service of a permanent employee on the basis of relevant standing orders without providing an opportunity of hearing to the employee who has been affected the order is vitiated.

15. This situation does not come to the rescue of the first party in this case. He has been served with a notice Ex. M1 and he has to blame himself for not taking the subsequent notices.

16. The removal from service does not amount to retrenchment as contented by the learned advocate for the first party. Sec. 25F laid down certain conditions preceding retrenchment of a workman. It does not deal with a permanent employee who remains absent unauthorisedly. If such a thing is happen the rules of the company governs that as a fact of the matter and therefore, the management should comply those conditions before passing an order of removal.

17. The management admittedly issued a notice to the known address given by the workman. If the workman contends that he was living in another address it is his duty to inform his employer the changed address. On the facts and circumstances the II party are justified in terminating the services of this workman.

18. The learned advocate for the first party has submitted that by taking into consideration the overall circumstances placed in this case, this Tribunal may invoke the benevolent provisions contained under Section 11A of the Act.

19. We are earlier held that this workman has remained absent without intimating the employer, of his intention to stay away from the work. He is a manual labourer who is doing the work of Chiselman and he

is not deprived of his livelihood even if he works elsewhere. He cannot remained absent deliberately and make the management to pay their price. It is not the intention of law. However, having regard to the fact that he has worked for a long period as a Chiselman there cannot be any impediment for his re-instatement without any monetary benefits. Having come to this conclusion, the following order is passed.

ORDER

The order of termination in respect of this workman passed by the management of the II party is hereby set aside. The second party are directed to reinstate this workman to the position he was held before his termination. There shall be continuity of service but he is not entitled for any monetary benefits from date of his absence which also includes payment of back wages.

The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the PA, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on 2-8-1999.)

JUSTICE R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

कां० अ० 2566.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सीसा गोदा लि० के प्रबन्धनत्व के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कार्मिकों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 1, मुम्बई के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-36012/3/95-आई० आर० (विविध)]
बी० एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2566.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Sesa Goa Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No L-36012/3/95-IR(Misc.)]
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI

PRESENT:

Justice Shri C. V. Govardhan, Presiding Officer
Reference No. CGIT 4 of 1996

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Sesa Goa Limited.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES:

For the Management: Shri Kanishk, Advocate.

For the Workman Shil Pereira, Advocate.
State : Maharashtra.
Mumbai, dated the 5th day of August, 1999

AWARD

The Central Government by its order dt. 13-2-96 has referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Sesa Goa Ltd. and their workmen for adjudication by this tribunal.

"Whether the action of General Manager, Sesa. Goa Limited PO No. 125, 2 OEDC, Complex, Pattel, Panjim-Coa-403 001 in dismissing the services of Shri Saji Y. Kamat, Ex-Head Clerk, Gaonkar Waddo, Verdhi, Sangualem (Goa) 403 305 w.e.f. 23-12-1994 is justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The averments in the Claim Statement are as follows : The workman was appointed as a Junior Clerk in the Stores Deptt. of the Employer's mining establishment w.e.f. 1-4-78. He was served with a Charge sheet dt. 10-11-93 alleging as follows :

- (i) That the workman arranged to issue 10 litres of ENKLO 68 and 40 litres of MG20W40 oils to M/s. Vantekar Transport. However, the workman made Gate Pass for only 5 litres of ENKLO 68 and 20 litres of MG20W40 Oil;
- (ii) That the workman prepared stores adjustment voucher dt. 6-10-1993 and filed a copy of the same at Sonshi Stores, but did not send the original of Sales Adjustment Voucher immediately to EDP as per procedure. He did not put serial numbers on the copies.
- (iii) The workman on 14-10-1993, released the original sales adjustment vouchers for oil and diesel to EDP by over-writing on the original dates, thereby tampering with the records. It was alleged that the workman has committed misconducts in terms of clauses 21(c) and 21(z-b) of the certified standing orders of the employer. The charge sheet dated 10-11-1993 was vague confusing and ambiguous. The enquiry on the basis of charge sheet, is in violation of principles of natural justice. The workman denied the charges levelled against him but the employers communicated his resolve to proceed with the enquiry. Shri S. R. Lotlikar, Personnel Manager of the employer was appointed as the Enquiry Officer. The workman requested that he may be permitted to be represented by a lawyer. The employer summarily rejected the request of the workman. Shri Sadashivan, the star witness of the company, during cross examination refused to answer certain pertinent and relevant question on the ground that in his opinion they were irrelevant. The Enquiry Officer was not in a position to have any control on the enquiry. It has caused serious prejudice to the workman. The Standing Orders of the year 1975 were not put on the Notice Board or made known to the workman at any time before issuance of the charge sheet. The workman is prejudiced since he was denied an opportunity of getting acquainted with the standing order. The non-disclosure of the standing orders has resulted in ex post facto determination. Any charge sheet which involves ex post facto determination is illegal. The enquiry is therefore, liable to be quashed. The main charge concerns the release of material in excess of what was listed in the documents. The material witness on behalf of the management would therefore be the watchman, Shri Prem Bahadur, on basis of whose alleged report, the alleged misconduct is alleged to have been discovered. The said Mr. Prem Bahadur did not report for duty after the charge sheet was issued. He was not examined by the management on the ground his whereabouts are not known. The efforts of the workman to produce Shri Prem Bahadur during the enquiry was thwarted by one means or the other. Non-production of material witness has caused prejudice. During the enquiry

Mr. Sadashivan undertook to produce certain documents for proving the alleged charges against the workman but the documents were not produced. The workman therefore, moved an application insisting upon the compliance of the undertaking. The said application was resisted and ultimately it was disallowed. The documents on which reliance has been placed by the Enquiry Officer were not furnished to the workman. The Enquiry Officer was a junior in rank than the Presenting Officer and the witness who appeared on behalf of the management. He had arrived at a conclusion that the charges against the workman were proved. On the basis of the said report, the employer has issued a letter dismissing the workman from service on 23rd December, 1995. The finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse. The order of dismissal passed on him is therefore, liable to be set aside. So far as the charges involving M/s. Vantekar Transport is concerned the evidence has disclosed that the same is not proved. The workman has alleged that the registers have been fabricated with a view to frame the workman. The charge is made at victimising the workman for having brought it to the notice of the management instances of the kind alleged against him and on account of which certain Senior Officers and Contractors were put in the dock. From the evidence, it is clear that the workman is not involved in any alleged fabrication or supply of diesel in excess of quantities recorded. Both on merits and on procedural infirmities the enquiry proceedings are liable to be quashed. Assuming that the workman has committed any offence the penalty of dismissal is harsh and disproportionate. The workman has put in 15 years of service. Alternate employment is neither possible nor feasible. The enquiry is a result of victimisation since the workman has pointed out instances which lead to discovery of certain frauds. The workman was promoted on 3 occasions and has been given incentives like certificates, promotion, wrist watch etc. They are not considered. Therefore, the workman prays that the reference may be answered in his favour, quashing the findings of the enquiry proceedings and ordering reinstatement with all consequential benefits.

3. The management in the written statement contends as follows: The workman was taken on regular employment with effect from 01-2-78 and as a Junior Clerk in Stores Department. He was promoted to the post of Clerk w.e.f. 1-1-80. On 20-9-86, the workman was involved in unnecessary arguments with his Senior Clerk. In the course of the said argument he had physically pushed Mr. Sawant, Senior Clerk and threatened to kill him. He was, therefore, issued with a warning letter. The workman was promoted to the post of Senior Clerk w.e.f. 1-1-84 and that of Head Clerk w.e.f. 1-1-90. On account of the gross negligence of the workman diesel tanker belonging to M/s. VG Quenim was unloaded in the installation of the Parry II. A warning was therefore, issued to the workman. On 6-10-93 while the workman was on duty in the normal shift he arranged to issue 10 litres of ENKLO 68 and 40 litres of MG 20W40 oils to M/s. Vantekar Transport; but he made a gate pass for only 5 litres of ENKLO 68 and 20 litres of MG 20W40 oils. He prepared a Stores Adjustment Voucher and filed a copy of the same at Sonshi Stores but did not send the original to EDP as per procedure. The management realised that the workman was involved in further acts of misconducts as against the actual quantity issued. The workman has recorded excess quantity in vouchers prepared on 6-10-93, 7-10-93 and 9-10-93. When the workman sensed that the investigations were being done, he released the original stores adjustment vouchers for oil and diesel to EDP on 14-10-93 by over writing the original dates in respect of M/s. Vantekar Transport without any authorisation or permission. On 14-10-93 he released further vouchers in respect of diesel issued to third namely M/s. Vantekar Transport which was suppressed earlier in order to cover the manipulation. The workman tampered with actual diesel issued quantity to the company's machine as well. The above acts of the workman being gross and serious misconduct under Certified Standing Orders he was issued with a charge sheet under clause 21(c) namely fraud or dishonesty in connection with the business and property of the company and 25(3-b) wilful falsification

or defacement of records of the company. Mr. Lotlikar was appointed as Enquiry Officer and he conducted the enquiry in which the workman participated fully, both in person and also through his authorised representative. Mr. Janardhan Gondhlekhar. The workman was given full opportunity to participate in the conduct of enquiry. After conclusion of the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer submitted his findings dated 28-9-94. The General Manager, Mining Operations furnished a copy of the findings of the workman. The workman was issued a show cause notice dated 18-11-99 calling upon him to show cause as to why punishment proposed should not be awarded to him. The explanation of the workman dated 25-11-94 was not found satisfactory and there was no reasons to reduce the proposed punishment of dismissal. The management has therefore, dismissed the workman from service by its order dated 23-12-94 with immediate effect. The acts of the employee which was so serious that it was not possible for the management to repose confidence in the employee. His retention would be detrimental to the management as well as the morale of other workers. The workman has been given the punishment of dismissal in a properly conducted enquiry on the misconduct committed by him. In the event, if the tribunal comes to the conclusion that the enquiry is vitiated for any reason, the management may be given an opportunity to adduce evidence before this tribunal to prove the charges. The workman is in gainful employment elsewhere.

4. My learned predecessor has framed the following issues for consideration.

- (1) Whether the enquiry held against the workman is not fair, legal and proper;
- (2) Whether on acceptable evidence adduced in the domestic enquiry, charges levelled against the workman are proved to the satisfaction of this tribunal?
- (3) Whether the punishment imposed on the workman is just and proper?

The workman challenges the domestic enquiry held against him as not fair and proper on several grounds. The first ground is on the allegation that the charge sheet issued to him is vague, not specific and ambiguous. On the very first day of the enquiry, specific question has been put to the workman by the Enquiry Officer as to whether he had understood the contents of the charge sheet and for the same he has replied that he has understood the charges against him and he has also sent a reply denying the same. It was not stated by him at that time that the charge sheet is vague or ambiguous. A perusal of the charge sheet shows the date of misconduct committed by the workman, the nature of misconduct committed by him and other details of manipulation tampering of records etc. and it cannot be stated that in spite of the above details the charge sheet is vague and ambiguous and on that ground the enquiry is to be held as not proper. It is to be noted that it is for the first time in the written statement filed by the workman a stand has been taken by him that the charge sheet is vague and not proper. In reply in the written arguments of the management, reference has been made to the decision of the Bombay High Court between Ramesh Baburaj Saval v/s. Bank of Baroda and other reported in 1988 (56) FLR page 164 wherein it has been stated that it is not open for the workman to raise a plea for the first time that the charge is vague when he has no complaint before the Enquiry Officer. Their Lordship have held that they are unable to accept the submission that the charge sheet was vague when it was taken for the first time before the tribunal. Therefore, the first ground on which the enquiry was challenged that the charge sheet was vague has to fail. The second ground on which the enquiry was challenged by the employee is that the Certified Standing Orders were not provided to him earlier and that he was not aware of the same. The workman is a member of the Union and he claims to be an active member of the union also. The standing orders have been framed only in consultation with the recognised union. The workman was appointed as per the contract of appointment provided in the Standing Orders. In the above circumstances it cannot be stated that the workman was not aware of the Standing Orders. Further, the contention of the workman is that the Standing Orders are not put up in the notice board in the place of employment of the workers. The workman admits

that there is a notice board in his place of employment. Therefore, it cannot be stated that the Standing Orders were not displayed in the notice board. When the workman was examined before this Tribunal before my learned predecessor he has stated that it is wrong to suggest that the Standing Orders were displayed on the Notice Board at the Mines but he admits that there was a notice board at the Mines. He has further admitted that he was aware that the company did have its Certified Standing Orders. When the workman was appointed as per the contract of appointment as mentioned in the Standing Orders and when the workman, was a member of the Union and when he was aware of the existence of Certified Standing Order for the Company, his contention that Standing Orders were not made available to him and therefore, the enquiry is improper is not convincing and acceptable. Further, the enquiry proceedings would show that the workman has been provided with the copy of the Standing Order subsequent to the issue of the charge sheet. It is not as if the workman has demanded the Standing Orders and the management has refused to give the same to the workman. Therefore, the ground that Certified Standing Orders were not made available to him and on account of the same the enquiry is to be held as not valid and not proper also has to be rejected.

6. The next ground of attack made by the workman is that he was not permitted to have the assistance of an Advocate in the enquiry proceedings. As far as this contention of the workman is concerned it is now a well established principle of law that in the domestic enquiry held against an employee, Advocate cannot be permitted to be engaged by the workman to defend himself unless the management is represented by an advocate. In the decision reported in 1989 LIC page 1569, between A. Veeman, vs. Management of Paramakudi Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd. and another the Madras High Court has held that a domestic enquiry against the workman is a managerial function and the conduct of the same is to be done by the management without the aid or intervention on either side of men of legal profession. In the decision reported in 1990 (61) FLR page 23 the Punjab and Haryana High Court has held that when the Enquiry Officer and the Presenting Officer of the management are not law graduate, refusal to allow workman to be represented by an Advocate would not vitiate the enquiry. In the case on hand, neither the Enquiry Officer nor management representative are said to be law graduates. Therefore, refusal to allow the workman to be represented by an Advocate cannot vitiate the enquiry. The workman has been represented by a person of his own choice and his claim that he was prejudiced since he was not permitted to have the assistance of a lawyer in defending him has vitiated the enquiry is therefore, not tenable. The next ground of challenge made by the worker regarding the enquiry is that the management representative is a higher Officer than the Enquiry Officer and the Enquiry Officer has remained to be a mute spectator of the enquiry proceedings and it was the management representative who had control over the enquiry and therefore, the enquiry is not valid and proper. As regards this contention is concerned the Enquiry Officer who has been examined before this Tribunal has categorically stated that he commenced the enquiry on 20-1-94 and conducted it in the presence of the workman and his representative one Mr. Janardhan Gondhlekhar till 25-7-94 giving full opportunity to them to participate in the enquiry, cross-examining witnesses, giving his own statement, examining his defence witness and ultimately he gave the finding. During cross-examination he has stated that the management representative was no doubt in a higher grade namely Grade-II and he was grade-III Officer; but it is false to say that he was consulted in preparation of the charge sheet and he conducted the enquiry in his capacity as a Manager (Personnel). The Manager (Personnel) is in the Headquarter and the management representative was in the Mines and it cannot be stated that the management representative being the Superior Officer of the Enquiry Officer, it was he, who had control over the enquiry. The workman examined before the Tribunal has stated that Mr. Sadashivan is only at Mines and Mr. Lotlikar is at the Head Office. Just because the management representative who was in the Mines was an Officer of higher category it cannot be stated that the enquiry has not been conducted fairly and properly. One of the grounds on which these allegations are made by the workman is that to certain questions put by him to Mr. Sadashivan, examined s MW-1, he has replied that the

question is irrelevant and did not answer those questions and that the Enquiry Officer was only a mute spectator of the same; but a perusal of the enquiry proceedings would show that when the workman was giving evidence certain questions put to him were refused to be answered by him on the ground that they are irrelevant and on those occasions also the Enquiry Officer did not intervene. If the Enquiry Officer was interested in the proceedings and was under the thumb of the management representative, one would expect him to direct the workman to answer the questions put to him by the management representative, but he has not done so. The failure of the Enquiry Officer to direct the workman to answer the question put to him by the management representative would falsify the theory of the workman that the Enquiry Officer being a subordinate to the management representative was a mute spectator and the enquiry proceedings were actually under the control of the management representative. Further, the proceedings of the enquiry would show that the Enquiry Officer has permitted the workman and his representative to cross-examine the management witness at length without any interference. It would also go to show that the claim of the workman that the Enquiry Officer being a subordinate to the management representative. The enquiry proceedings were actually under the control of the management representative is to be rejected. Just because the management representative occupies a higher position in the company, the enquiry conducted by Mr. Lotliger in his capacity as Personnel Manager cannot be said to be not proper and legal to vitiate the entire enquiry.

7. The next ground of attack made by the workman is that the management has not examined Mr. Prem Bahadur, Watchman as a witness in spite of his being a proper person to speak to the taking of 50 litres with one Gate pass for 25 litres of oil. According to the management the watchman has only to see whether the gate pass is provided to the Lorry and he is not expected to see the quantity of oil taken in the lorry. Apart from that, it is also the case of the management that the watchman was not their employee and he was an employee of the Contractor who has been dismissed from service and his whereabouts are not known. Therefore, he could not be examined. None of these versions of the management is denied by the workman. The workman himself has taken steps to bring Mr. Prem Bahadur as a defence witness. The enquiry was adjourned twice to enable the workman to produce Mr. Prem Bahadur. Mr. Prem Bahadur has been served with a letter issued by the workman to come and depose before the enquiry and the workman has also filed the acknowledgment before the Enquiry Officer; but in spite of it Mr. Prem Bahadur has not chosen to appear before the Enquiry Officer and give evidence. It is not as if the management has cited Prem Bahadur as one of their witnesses and failed to examine him. It is not as if the workman was not given any opportunity to examine Prem Bahadur as a defence witness. On the other hand in spite of his efforts to examine Prem Bahadur the workman was not successful. In the above circumstances the contention of the workman that Prem Bahadur was not examined as a witness for the management and on that ground the enquiry is vitiated is not a tenable contention.

8. The next ground of attack made by the workman is that after the Enquiry Officer has submitted his findings the show cause notice was issued by the Director, Iron Ore and he is not the competent person to issue the same. The Enquiry Officer has stated in his evidence before the Tribunal that when the company became public the post of Technical Manager has been abolished and it was re-designated as Technical Director and two years later the Technical Director was re-designated as Director, Iron Ore. This evidence of the Enquiry Officer during cross-examination would show that there is no merits in the contention of the workman that the show cause notice has not been issued by the competent person. The workman who has given evidence before this Tribunal does not explain as to how the show cause notice was not issued by the competent person, in view of the fact that the Technical Manager was re-designated as Technical Director and subsequently again re-designated as Director, Iron Ore. I am of opinion that the contention of the workman that the show cause notice was not issued by the Competent Authority has to be rejected.

9. The next ground of attack made by the workman is that he has preferred an appeal against the order of dismissal and it has not been ordered and his right to appeal against the order having been deprived to him, the enquiry is vitiated. The workman who has given evidence before this Tribunal has been put a suggestion that he has not filed any appeal but a notice of demand. He has replied that he styled his letter dated 4-1-95 as a demand for reinstatement and he has addressed it to the Director, Iron Ore. It is stated by him that there is a Chairman of the Company and he did not address any appeal to the Chairman of the Company. When the workman has addressed a letter for reinstating him to the Director, Iron Ore who has passed the order of dismissal against him, it cannot be considered as an appeal made by him. It is more so, when the workman has not addressed any appeal to the Chairman of the Company challenging the order passed by the Director, Iron Ore against the order of dismissal. In the above circumstances it cannot be stated that the workman has really preferred an appeal and it was not heard at all and thereby the workman has been deprived an opportunity to challenge the order of dismissal by preferring an appeal. Therefore, on this ground also the enquiry cannot be said to be not legal and proper. The workman challenges the enquiry on the ground that the enquiry officer is biased and has not conducted the enquiry impartially as he was an Officer of the Management. I have already observed that the enquiry officer who has given evidence before this Tribunal has stated that he has nothing to do with framing of charge sheet against the worker. In his capacity as Personnel Manager, no doubt, he has participated in the Settlement Proceedings but it was not when he was acting as an Enquiry Officer. Therefore, since the Enquiry Officer has participated in a Settlement Proceedings subsequently, when he was not the Enquiry Officer representing the management, it cannot be a ground to hold that the Enquiry Officer was biased and did not conduct enquiry properly and legally. It may not be out of context to observe that in the written arguments filed by the workman, it is stated that even if the Tribunal is inclined to look at the above factors as mere irregularities either not material or not vitiating the enquiry, even in that case it could be just, right and proper with this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to pass appropriate directions-stiches in each of this respects for the future guidance of the Enquiry Officer, Disciplinary Authority and Appellate Authorities. The prayer in the above written arguments would by itself show that none of the grounds raised by the workman challenging the enquiry as not valid and proper are mere irregularities and not material. Therefore, I am of opinion that there is no substance in the contention of the workman that the domestic enquiry held against him is not fair, proper and legal and hold on Issue No. 1 accordingly.

Issue No. 2 :

It is the contention of the workman that the findings of the Enquiry Officer is not based on acceptable evidence placed before Enquiry Officer and it is a perverse one. Before proceeding further, I am of opinion that it is better to recollect certain established principle of law on this aspects. In the decision reported in 1982 11 J 46 State of Haryana v/s. Rattan Singh, the Supreme Court has held that it is well settled that in a domestic enquiry strict and sophisticated rules of evidence under the evidence Act may not apply and though all material which are logically probative for a prudent mind are permissible. The Supreme Court has also held that there is no allergy to hear say evidence provided it has reasonable nexus and credibility. In the decision reported in 1995 Supreme Court page 561 Government of Tamilnadu vs. A. Rajapandian, Supreme Court has held that the Administrative Tribunal cannot sit as a Court of Appeal over the decision based on the findings of the enquiry authority in disciplinary proceedings and that when there is some relevant material which the disciplinary authority has accepted and which material reasonably support the conclusion reached by the disciplinary authority, it is not the function of the Administrative Tribunal to review the same and reach different findings that that of the disciplinary authority. Even though the above decision has arisen out of the order passed by the Tamil Nadu Administrative Tribunal and refers to Administrative Tribunals Act the principle laid down in the above decision applies in all force, in respect of Industrial Tribunals under the Industrial Dispute Act. Now let us

discuss the question whether acceptable evidence has been adduced before the Enquiry Officer in order to prove the charge against the workman. The charge against the workman are two folds. The first of it is in respect of the allegation that the workman has given only one gate pass for a total of 25 litres of oil to M/s. Vantekar Transport while actually the Vantekar Transport was supplied with 50 litres of oil under the Sales Adjustment Vouchers, prepared on 6-10-95. The second is that the workman has prepared Sales Adjustment Vouchers on 6th, 7th, and 9th of October 1993 as if 230 litres of oil were supplied to the Departmental machines, when actually they were supplied only less quantity and by making correction in the Sales Vouchers, these 230 litres of diesel was actually diverted to M/s. Vantekar Transport. The explanation of the workman is simple in so far as the correction regarding the gate pass dated 6-10-93 is concerned. According to the workman he prepared 4 vouchers in triplicate for 20 plus 20 plus 5 plus 5 litres of oil on 6-10-93 and gave them to the Purchasing party and since the purchasing party told that he is having shortage of containers and he will take only 25 litres then and will collect the remaining 25 litres thereafter one gate pass alone was prepared and handed over to the purchasing party. But it is the case of the management that if the workman had prepared Sales Adjustment Vouchers for 50 litres there is no necessity for keeping three Sales Adjustment Vouchers with him without sending them to EDP, codli, and preparation of one gate pass and delivering it to the purchasing party for the entire quantity for which Sales Adjustment Voucher have been prepared is improper. DW-2 Mr. Krishna Vantekar has deposed before the Enquiry Officer that he himself and his brother were given two trucks namely SG 69 and SG 29, by the management and on 6-10-93 he had gone to the Stores for getting oil for his vehicle as well as for his brother's vehicle and took the entire quantity out with one gate pass of 25 litres. DW-2 has taken out 50 litres of lubricants on the basis of one gate pass of 25 litres is not in dispute. If really DW-2 had informed the workman that he has not brought containers to lift the entire quantity of oil and he would lift only 25 litres at the first instance the employee could have issued Sales Adjustment Voucher to the purchaser, only for 25 litres and ask him to come and collect Sales Adjustment Vouchers for the rest of 25 litres when he comes with another container. There is no reason as to why the workman had issued one Sales Adjustment Voucher for the entire quantity of 50 litres and issued one gate pass for 25 litres. It is not as if the workman is not aware that diesel would be supplied as per Sales Adjustment Vouchers by the Pump Operator. The fact that the workman has prepared Sales Adjustment Voucher for the entire quantity and he has handed over one to the purchaser for taking delivery of 50 litres and delivering him one gate pass for the above 50 litres would show that there is something fishy in the conduct of the workman. In the written arguments it is stated that there is no charge of any theft or loss of property to the management and when the Sales Adjustment Voucher were subsequently produced and despite of 50 litres is recorded it cannot be stated that the workman has committed any misconduct as alleged. The charge is not for theft or for causing loss to the management. The charge is specific in stating that the workman has manipulated vouchers. It is not disputed by the workman that he had changed the date and the running number in the Sales Adjustment Vouchers when he contends that on 14-10-93 only he got back the Sales Adjustment Vouchers and therefore, he has changed the date, as well as the running number. The purpose of putting the date in the Sales Adjustment voucher is to specify the date on which the Sale had taken place. It is not open for either the workman or any other person to change the date even assuming that he has received the Sales Adjustment Voucher only on 14-10-93 and not earlier. But this claim of the workman is also not tenable since the document namely Ex-38 produced from Koli shows that it is in respect of transaction dated 18-10-93 and still it had the running serial number of 21-10-93 and the workman herein who had affixed his signature in it has not changed the date or running number in that exhibit. The date in the Sales Adjustment voucher being the date of preparation of the voucher changing the date in it would defeat the very purpose of affixing date and therefore the claim of the workman that he has changed the date in the Sales Adjustment Voucher prepared on 6-10-93 as on 14-10-93 since he has received it only on 14-10-93 is not a tenable one. Ex-9, 10

and 11 are vouchers in which the workman has changed the dates. His explanation that he has changed the date since he has received it on 14-10-93 is unacceptable. Therefore, the finding of the Enquiry Officer that the change of manipulating the vouchers by correcting the dates has been proved cannot be said to an improper one.

The second portion of this charge is, the workman has recorded excess supply of diesel supplied to the machinery of the Company. According to the management, in respect of Compressor 134, Haulpack 611 and 610, the workman has recorded supply of 120, 250 and 240 litres while in fact these machineries were supplied with 80, 225 and 215 litres of diesel alone. Ex-12 would show that these machineries namely Compressor 135 was issued with 80 litres and Haulpack 611 was supplied with 225 litres and Haulpack 610 was supplied with 215 litres. Likewise, on 7-10-93 Water Pump 572 was actually issued with 435 litres of diesel as per Ex-12 whereas the workman has recorded 525 litres excess as per Ex-1. Similarly on 9-10-93 Water Pump 572 was supplied with 720 litres of diesel as per Ex-12 whereas the workman has recorded issue of 760 litres as seen from Ex-14. On 9-10-93 the Compressor was issued with a diesel of 800 litres only whereas the workman has recorded issue of 90 litres as per Ex-15. It is thus seen that the workman has recorded excess supply of 230 litres to the Company's machinery and vehicles. The only ground on which it is challenged is by stating that the Ex-12 is not a genuine document. But Ex-12 contains several hand writing made by the workman and it is not explained by him why such an entry showing excess of delivery of Lubricants has been made by the workman. But we can infer the same from the fact that in so far as the machineries and vehicles of the company, the company itself issues diesel and lubricants at its own cost whereas for vehicles owned by the company and given to the private operators and also for vehicles belonging to private operators even though the company supplies the diesel and oil, the cost is deducted from the running bills of the Contractors every fortnight. By showing excess supply of lubricants to the company's vehicles and machineries and diverting excess to the vehicles of the Operators cannot be without any purpose. Therefore, it is under these circumstances the charge of manipulating the documents assumes importance. According to the management the workman has tampered with the records in respect of the diesel supplied to M/s. Vantekar Transport on 6th, 7th and 9th October 1993 by increasing the sales to the Company's machineries with a dishonest intention. This contention of the management, therefore, cannot be said to be a baseless one. Preponderance of probabilities have to be looked into in assessing the evidence let in before the Enquiry Officer as to whether the charge against the workman has been proved.

As I have already observed, while analysing the evidence placed before the Enquiry Officer in a domestic enquiry the tribunal is not acting as a Appellate Authority and it has only to see whether on the materials placed before the Enquiry Officer, the charge against the workman has been proved on the basis of preponderance of probabilities I am of opinion that in the case on hand the very admission of the workman that he has changed the dates and also the serial numbers by itself be sufficient to hold that on the legal evidence adduced in the domestic enquiry, the charge against the workman has been proved. The Enquiry Officer has given a finding that the charge against the workman has been proved and I am of opinion that it has to be considered as a finding given by a reasonable person on the materials placed before him and therefore, I hold on Issue No. 2 that on acceptable evidence adduced in the domestic enquiry the charge against the workman stands proved.

Issue No. 3: The workman is holding a post of confidence. He had acted in such a way that the management would be put to loss if his conduct had not been found out and prevented at the earlier opportunity. On prior occasions also the workman was not having a clear record. He has been issued with a warning letter on 11-10-86 for acts subversive of discipline. He was issued with a warning on 17-8-92, after getting his explanation for acts of gross negligence on his part while unloading a diesel tanker. When the previous conduct of the workman was not credit worthy and when the charge against the workman herein has been proved it cannot be stated that the punishment imposed on the workman is not just and proper. In that view I hold on Issue No. 3 that the punishment

given to the workman is just and proper. I hold on Issue No. 3 accordingly.

In the result, an Award is passed as follows :

"The action of the General Manager, Sesagoa Ltd. in dismissing the service of Shri Saji Y. Kamat. Ex-Head Clerk w.e.f. 23-12-94 is justified and he is not entitled to any relief."

C. V. GOVARDHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०अ० 2567.—श्रीयोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑर्डनेन्स इक्विपमेन्ट फैक्टरी, अवधि के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित श्रीयोगिक विवाद में श्रीयोगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-14012/6/94-आई०आर० (डी०यू०)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2567.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Ordnance Equipment Factory Avadi and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-8-99.

[No L-14012/6/94-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
TAMIL NADU, CHENNAI

TAMIL NALU

Monday, the 31st day of May, 1999

PRESENT :

THIRU S. ASHOK KUMAR, M.Sc., B.L.,

Industrial Tribunal

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 43/1995

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workman and the management of The General Manager, Ordnance Equipment Factory, (Madras-54).

BETWEEN :

Sri R. K. Madhavan,
16, Nachiarumal Street,
Pulianthope,
Madras-600 012.

And

The General Manager,
Ordnance Equipment Factory,
Group Clothing Factory,
Avadi,
Madras-600 054.

Reference :

Order No. L-14012/6/94-IR(DU) dated 4-3-95,
Ministry of Labour, Government of India,
New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Monday, the 19th day of April, 1999 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statement and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Mr. M. Umabaskaran and Mr. Mani, advocates appearing for the workman and of Thiru K. Karunakaran, Asst. Standing Central Govt. Counsel appearing for the management, and the dispute having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following :

AWARD

This reference has been made for adjudication of the following issue :

"Whether the action of the management of Ordnance Equipment factory (OEF) Avadi in terminating the services of Sri R. K. Madhavan is justified. If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The main averments found in the claim statement filed Petitioner are as follows.—The petitioner was appointed as Viewer Grade-C in 1963 in the respondent's factory and made quasi-permanent with effect from 1-11-1967. Lastly he was working as Examiner Grade-II, and his last drawn wages was Rs. 540 p.m. and his services were blemishless. Due peptic ulcer, petitioner's health started deteriorating from 26-12-73 and therefore he applied for sick leave on 31-12-73 w.e.f. 28-12-73. Thereafter the petitioner extended leave from 9-11-74 with which he sent a Medical certificate (issued by Dr. Captain S. Amrithalingam) and the same was sent on 12-2-1974. On account of further deterioration in his condition the petitioner also became mentally sick and was under treatment of Major Dr. A. S. Johnson. He became fit to rejoin duty on 21-4-75 and the said doctor issued a medical certificate dated 20-4-1975. The petitioner reported for duty on 21-4-75, and handed over the fitness certificate to the Office of the Labour bureau. But the Head Clerk of the said section asked him to obtain the rubber stamp of the doctor on the certificate and report for work. Thereafter, the petitioner went to the factory for re-submitting the fitness certificate on 23-4-75 and he was prevented by the Security Gate Keeper Mr. Rangarajan who retained the certificate for being forwarded to the higher-ups and he did not allow the petitioner inside. The petitioner was informed by the said Gate keeper that he was instructed not to allow the petitioner inside the factory premises without written permission from the General Manager. When the petitioner informed the wanted to handover the Certificate to Labour Bureau the Gate keeper directed the petitioner to handover the certificate to him. The said Gate keeper made an

endorsement on the office note given to the petitioner by the Head Clerk of the Labour Bureau. The Labour Officer of the respondent acknowledged receipt of the fitness certificate by forwarding it to the Assistant Manager (LB) for taking appropriate action by his letter dt. 23-4-75 and a copy of which was sent to the petitioner. There was no response from the respondent management after he submitted the fitness certificate. The petitioner was served with show cause notice dated 14-5-75 to show cause why proposed punishment of removal from service should not be inflicted on him. The said show cause notice spoke of charges, evidence, enquiry etc. and alleged enquiry report has also been enclosed. By the said Enquiry findings, the Enquiry officer had found the petitioner guilty of the charge of "continued unauthorised absence" from duty and not guilty of the charge of "refusal to accept official letter." Prior to service of the said show cause notice, respondent had not served the petitioner either the charge sheet or the enquiry notice. Petitioner had sent his reply dated 20-5-1975 to the show cause memo dated 14-5-75, and the petitioner has stated that the Enquiry report does not indicate about his illness and treatment mentioned in the medical certificate given by Dr. (Major) A. S. Johnson, dated 20-4-75. The petitioner has also referred to the letter dated 23-4-75 of the Labour Officer wherein it has been stated that the certificate received from the petitioner has been forwarded for appropriate action. The respondent had not refused sick leave to the petitioner. Since the respondent was silent after receiving the petitioner's reply dated 20-5-1975, the petitioner sent lawyer's notice dated 31-1-1975 and on 17-3-1976 requesting the respondents to permit him to join duty. But there was no response from the respondent. Thereafter petitioner himself sent letters dated 3-12-1976, and 6-4-1977 which was of no avail. Hence, another lawyer notice dated 23-9-1977 was sent to the respondent. The respondent did not care to reply. The petitioner was always wishing to join duty. Thereafter the petitioner filed a petition before the Labour Officer (Chengalpet) at Madras regarding his non-employment. The same was sent to the Asst. Commissioner of Labour (Madras). The Regional Commissioner of Labour informed the petitioner that they have issued a notice of hearing on 23-2-78 to the respondent's officer in-charge. But the respondent did not respond for the notice itself. Since there was no termination of service the petitioner was constrained to file a claim petition No. 67/78 under Sec. 33(c)(2) of the I.D. Act, 1947, but the same was dismissed as not maintainable. The case of the respondent before the Labour Court was that the petitioner has not reported for duty, when in fact the petitioner was not allowed to enter the factory premises by the Security Gate Keeper. Thereafter the petitioner sent lawyer's notice dt. 10-3-80 to the respondent intimating that he has been always ready to rejoin the duty. By the said notice respondent had been required to give written authorisation to permit the petitioner to enter inside the premises and do work. Thereafter a reminder dt. 9-5-80 was sent to the respondent through his lawyer. Without reference to the said notice and the reminder the respondent confirmed the petitioner of removal from service by an order dt. 10-9-80. The petitioner sent a letter dt. 29-10-80 stating that the order of termination is illegal and invalid. In the said order

medical certificate dt. 20-4-75 has not been referred to and there was no application of mind by the General Manager while issuing the said order of removal. Further representation was sent on 28-4-88 requesting the Regional Labour Commissioner to initiate conciliation talks. Thereafter conciliation proceedings were held on 14-2-92 and the petitioner appeared in the conciliation proceedings. The respondent failed to appear in any of the proceedings before the Conciliation officer and therefore Asst. Commissioner of Labour sent a failure report on 11-3-94. After petitioner's letter dt. 12-9-94, the Government of India has referred the dispute for adjudication by an order dt. 21-7-95. Order removing the petitioner from service by the respondent is not valid in law. The said order is violative of natural justice since the petitioner has not been served with any charge sheet or enquiry notice. No opportunity whatsoever has been granted to the petitioner to show that he was not guilty of the alleged charges. The alleged enquiry is an eye wash. Enquiry has been during the period when the petitioner was sick or was on medical leave. Enquiry Officer's alleged findings are perverse. The reasons given in by him for holding's the petitioner not guilty of the second charge hold good for the petitioner inability to attend the enquiry and therefore he ought not to have proceeded to hold the enquiry ex parte. The absence of the petitioner has not been unauthorised. On the contrary the petitioner was on medical leave and hence his absence from duty was authorised. The appropriate rules and standing orders have not been applied in the case of the petitioner, and it is a clear case of victimisation since the respondent has passed the order of removal only after the petitioner filed Court cases. The past record of the petitioner has not been taken into consideration. Even assuming without admitting that the petitioner is guilty of the charge, the punishment inflicted upon him is shockingly disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct. Even during the enquiry VDC Incharge Mustering Group, LB section stated that the petitioner was a regular employee. The respondent has failed to consider the past record of the petitioner. The respondent ought to have seen the reason for the absence was illness supported by medical certificates. Therefore, the absence would not amount to misconduct. The petitioner is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages, continuity of service and other attendant benefits. The petitioner prays to pass an award declaring that the order of removal of the petitioner as illegal and arbitrary and consequentially to pay the arrears of salary from the dates of removal till the date of superannuation and further direct the respondent to pay pension and other retirement benefits w.e.f. i.e. the notional date of superannuation.

3. The main averments found in the counter statement filed by the respondent are as follows :—The petition is not maintainable in law and on facts. The petitioner was imposed with the penalty of "Removal from service w.e.f. 10-9-80 by an Order No. 1806/55/74 vig. dt. 10-9-80 in accordance with the provisions contained in CCS (CC & A) Rules, 1965—There is a mandatory provision in the said Rules for a Departmental Appeal (Rule 27 of the said Rules) which the petitioner has not availed of. The action of the petitioner in seeking legal remedy by-passing the departmental channel is legally untenable. Hence the present I.D. is not maintainable and deserves to be dismissed in

limini for the said reason alone. The petitioner remained absent from duty right from 27-12-1973 without intimation and prior sanction of leave of the respondent. The petitioner by his application for leave dated 31-12-1973 informed that he was suffering from ulcer complaint and requested for grant of sick leave from 28-12-73. He also informed the respondent that he would produce Medical Certificate at the time of joining duty. By another application for leave dt. 9-2-1974, the petitioner intimated the respondent that he is forwarding M.C. for the period from 28-12-73 without actually enclosing the said M.C. and requested for grant of leave. The respondent by its letter dt. 11-2-74 informed the petitioner that the M.C. stated to have been enclosed with the application dt. 9-2-74 had not been sent by him and therefore asked him to produce the said M.C. immediately. In response the petitioner produced an M.C. dt. 13-2-74 covering his absence from 28-12-73 for an indefinite period. Thereafter the petitioner did not report for duty for quite a long period. Hence the respondent vide letter dt. 24-9-74 directed the petitioner in accordance with the extant rules, to report to the Medical Officer of the Factory Health Clinic to ascertain the fact as to whether the petitioner was actually 'unfit' for duty. The said letter was sent by Regd. Ack. due but returned back undelivered with the postal authorities remarks "refused". The petitioner did not rejoin duty as alleged by him on 21-4-75. It is denied that the petitioner was prevented from entering the factory premises by Security. It is also denied that the Security Personnel retained his fitness certificate for onward transmission to their higher ups and did not allow the petitioner to enter the factory. It is not correct that the Security Gate Keeper informed him that he got instructions not to allow him inside the factory without written permission of the G.M. It is denied that the petitioner was informed by Security Gate Keeper that he could report for duty after getting orders from the management. The petitioner is trying to mislead the Court by saying all of a sudden show cause notice dt. 14-5-75 was received by him on the proposed penalty of "removal from service." For the misconduct of "unauthorised absence from duty and refusal to accept official letter dt. 24-9-74 sent to him by regd. post to his last known address he was issued with a charge memo dt. 2-11-74 which was sent to him by Regd. Post A/D. This letter was returned undelivered with the remarks "not found during delivery time after having been tried by postman as many as on 7 occasions." On 19-12-74, another letter was sent by the respondent intimating the petitioner about the appointment of a Court of Enquiry under Rule 14 of CCS (CC&A) Rules, 1964 which was also returned back with the endorsement refused." The petitioner was avoiding the letters from the respondent. The Enquiry officer addressed letters dt. 30-12-74, 22-1-75 to the petitioner and sent by Regd. Post A/D but were returned back with postal endorsement "refused". When the letters sent to the petitioner were refused to be received by him, it is deemed to be proper service of these letters. Thus there was no suddenness in the action taken by the respondent. All the correspondences issued by the respondent or by the E.O. were in consequence with the Rules were sent by Regd. post and were refused to be received/acknowledged by the petitioner. This was a deliberate act committed by the

petitioner with ulterior motives. The E.O. appointed to conduct the enquiry had proceeded in ex-parte and submitted his findings concluding that the charges framed against the petitioner had been proved on the basis of the records produced before him. The disciplinary Authority thereafter issued a show cause notice to the petitioner as per the then existing procedure calling upon him to explain as to why the penalty of "removal from service", should not be imposed on him. This show cause notice was however received by the petitioner who sent a reply referring to the Medical Certificate dt. 20-4-75 which he had sent to this respondent through the L.O. But the petitioner had not given any explanation to the show cause notice and several letters sent to him by this respondent. Even by a letter dt. 26-6-76, the petitioner was informed that he could report for duty immediately without prejudice to the departmental disciplinary action already initiated and kept pending without a final decision. But this letter was also endorsed back with the endorsement "left". Hence no further action could be taken. It is established that there was no change in the address of the petitioner because he received and sent reply to the show cause notice dt. 14-5-75 from the same address. Since the petitioner had already been given opportunity to join duty, there was no need to issue any reply to the legal notice sent by his counsel. The petitioner without availing the remedies available to him under the Rules by which he is governed he has knocked at the wrong doors. This petition also suffers from laches. The petitioner has not clearly brought out the full facts of the two claim petitions filed by him before the Principal Labour Court, Madras under Sec. 33(c)(2) of I.D. Act, claiming arrears of salary for the period from 1-12-72 to 30-6-78 and 1-7-78 to 1-6-80 respectively. The claim petition numbered as CCF 67 on 1978 was dismissed vide Order dt. 7-2-80 by the Central Govt. Labour Madras observing as under:

"It is in the evidence of R.W.1 that until this day, they have neither suspended nor terminated the services of the petitioner. It is clear that the enquiry against the petitioner has not been completed and final orders passed."

the contention of the petitioner that he was not allowed to enter the factory premises by the Security has no merit and is legally untenable. The petitioner has preferred an appeal against the aforesaid order of Principal Labour Court and the same was dismissed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras. There was no order stopping or disallowing the petitioner from joining duty or even entering the factory for duty. The petitioner for the reasons best known to him had deliberately chosen to absent himself for duty. There was no absolute necessity for the management to intimate him that he could resume duty. The Disciplinary authority had waited for the disposal of the claim petition CCF 67/78 and as the petitioner even after rejection of the said claim petition had not considered necessary to join duty on his own, an Order was passed by the Disciplinary Authority on the pending disciplinary action removing him from service w.e.f. 10-9-80 under CCS (CC&A) Rules, 1965, based on ex-parte proceedings held against him for his misconduct of "unauthorised absence from duty from 28-12-73". The reference is bad in law and on facts. The action in

question taken against the petitioner was under CCS (CC & A) Rules 1965 by which the petitioner is governed. There is a mandatory provision under the said Rules for an appeal before the Appellate Authority created under the same Rules. The petitioner without exhausting the departmental relief as available under the said Rules has chosen to obtain direct remedy under the I.D. Act which is bad in law. The respondent prays to dismiss the claim of the petitioner.

4. No witness was examined on behalf of both sides. On behalf of the petitioner Ex. W1 to W-41 have been marked. On behalf of the respondent management Ex. M.1 and M.2 have been marked.

5. The point for consideration is : Whether the action of the management of Ordnance Equipment Factory, Avadi in terminating the services of Sri R. K. Madhavan, is justified. If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to."

6. The Point : The petitioner Th. R. K. Madhavan was appointed in the respondent management clothing factory as vewen Grade C in 1963 and was made quasi-permanent w.o.f. 1-11-67. Lastly he was working as Examiner Grade II with a pay of Rs. 540 p.m. The petitioner applied for sick leave on 31-12-73 w.o.f. 28-12-73 and extended the leave by a letter dt. 9-1-74 with a medical certificate issued by Captain S. Amritharajan, which was sent on 12-2-74. After prolonged illness and treatment under Dr. A. S. Johnson petitioner became fit to rejoin duty on 21-4-75 and the said Doctor issued Ex. W-1 medical certificate dt. 20-4-75. When the said certificate was produced by the petitioner the Labour Officer has made an endorsement Ex. W-2 asking the petitioner to get the rubber stamp on the medical certificate before it is sent for consideration by the General Manager. On 23-4-75 the medical fitness certificate was received by the Security Gate Keeper who made an endorsement Ex. W-3 that he received the fitness certificate as advised by the Labour Officer on 23-4-75 at 9.15 a.m. The same day the Labour Officer sent Ex. W-4 letter along with medical certificate received from the petitioner for favour and appropriate action. Meanwhile an enquiry has been conducted against the petitioner for his unauthorised absence which is the cause of sending letter dt. 14-5-75 by the respondent management to the petitioner (letter not produced) for which the petitioner sent Ex. W-5 reply stating that the enquiry does not indicate anything about his illness and treatment mentioned in the medical certificate given by Dr. A. S. Johnson dt. 20-4-75 and requesting to reconsider the matter to make him rejoin duty immediately. The postal acknowledgement for Ex. W-5 letter is Ex. W-6. The petitioner has also produced Ex. W-7 and W-8 postal acknowledgements and Ex. W-9 certificate of posting for some communication sent by him to the respondent management without producing the copies of the letters so sent by him. On 31-1-76 Petitioner's Advocate has sent a notice to the respondent wherein he has mentioned about the illness and medical certificate produced by the petitioner and permit him to join duty and also about sending of Show Cause notice dt. 14-5-75 as to why the proposed penalty of removal from service based on the enquiry should not be implemented. Counsel has further requested the respondent management to reconsider the proposed action of removal from service and to admit the petitioner in service. Postal acknowledgement for the said notice is

Ex. W-11. On 17-3-76 the same Advocate has sent a reminder to the respondent management and has threatened to initiate legal proceedings if the respondent failed to permit the petitioner to join duty within 1 week. Postal acknowledgement for Ex. W-12 notice is Ex. W-13. On 3-12-76 the petitioner himself has sent Ex. W-14 letter to the respondent intimating his intention to take legal action against respondent and also informing the respondent about his complaint to Prime Minister of India, President of India for violating 20 point programme which was then prevailing. The Certificate of posting for Ex. W-14 letter is Ex. W-15. On 6-4-77 the petitioner has sent Ex. W-16 letter to the Labour Officer of the respondent management requesting a reply regarding the medical certificate submitted by him and intimating his intention to initiate legal proceedings. Certificate of posting of Ex. W-16 letter is Ex. W-17. On 22-9-77 on behalf of the petitioner another advocate by name Palattichamy has sent Ex. W-18 notice to the respondent asking the respondent to admit the petitioner into service with full back wages failing which legal action would be taken. Postal acknowledgement for Ex. W-18 notice is W-19. On 6-12-78 Labour Officer (Chengalpattu) Madras has forwarded an application sent by the petitioner to Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central) for taking further action in the matter, and the said letter is Ex. W-20. On 20-3-78, the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) has informed the petitioner that inspite of reference made to the respondent's officer incharge, no reply has been received from them and the said letter is Ex. W-21. The petitioner filed C.P. 67/78 before the Central Government Labour Court at Madras claiming a sum of Rs. 29,735.96 being salary from 31-12-73 to 30-10-76 at the rate of Rs. 540.68 per month and the claim petition preferred by the petitioner is Ex. W-22. The counter statement filed by the respondent in the said claim petition 67/78 is Ex. W-22, and the letter by the counsel for the petitioner to the respondent's counsel to produce 3 documents is Ex. W-23. The order passed by the Central Govt. Labour Court (Principal Labour Court) Madras in C.P. No. 67/78, is Ex. W-24, wherein the Labour Court has dismissed the application filed by the petitioner, on 7-12-80. After dismissal of the claim petition filed by the petitioner by the Labour Court, the petitioner's counsel sent Ex. W-25 notice to the respondent, demanding written authorisation to permit the petitioner to enter into the premises and do he work. The postal acknowledgement for Ex. W-25 letter is Ex. W-26. On 9-5-80 the same Advocate has sent Ex. W-27 reminder to the respondent management enclosing a copy of the previous notice i.e. Ex. W-25. On 10-9-80 the General Manager of the respondent has issued final order removing the petitioner from service for the misconduct of continued unauthorised absence from duty. On 24-9-80 the petitioner sent Ex. W-29 representation to the General Manager of the respondent stating that termination order is not valid in law. The postal acknowledgement for the said letter is Ex. W-30. The application filed by the petitioner before the Regional Labour Commissioner for conciliation is Ex. W-31. A memo filed by the petitioner before the Regional Labour Commissioner to initiate the proceedings is Ex. W-32. The letter dt. 27-4-92 sent by the petitioner to the Regional Labour Commissioner for initiating conciliation pro-

ceedings is Ex. W-33 and the postal acknowledgement for Ex. W-33 is W-34. Minutes of conciliation proceedings held on 14-12-92 is Ex. W-35 wherein conciliation officer has recorded the contentions of the workmen, whereas the views of the employer could not be recorded as he remained absent. Conciliation failure report is Ex. W-36. The petitioner's letter to the Secretary of the Govt. of India on 12-9-94 is Ex-W-37 wherein he has requested the Secretary to refer the dispute to the Industrial Tribunal, Madras. The postal acknowledgement for Ex-W-34 is W-38. The petitioner's letter to the Presiding Officer of the Central Government Labour Court requesting the return of original documents filed by him in C.P. 67/78 is W-40. The judgement of the Central Administrative Tribunal in T.A. No. 310 of 1987 restoring W.P. 674/81 on the file of the Hon'ble High Court is Ex. W-41.

7. The contention of the petitioner is that when the petitioner went with Ex. W-1 medical certificate to the respondent and on producing the same on 23-4-75 the respondent did not permit the petitioner to enter into the factory premises and did not permit him to join duty. The contention of the respondent management is that the petitioner was unauthorisedly absent from 27-12-73, and therefore a charge was framed against the petitioner for his unauthorised absence and in spite of repeated attempts charge sheet could not be served on the petitioner since all the letters and notices sent to the last known address of the petitioner in the service records of the respondent returned with endorsement as not found or refused and therefore an ex parte enquiry was conducted against the petitioner and among the two charges (1) unauthorised absence, (2) refusal to receive the Order of the Management, the first charge has been held proved by the Enquiry Officer and on the basis of the proved misconduct the petitioner has been terminated from service.

8. Before this Tribunal both the parties have not produced the charge memo, enquiry notices, enquiry proceedings and findings of the Enquiry Officer. In para 4 of the claim statement itself, the petitioner has admitted that he received a show cause notice dt. 14-5-75 requiring him to show cause why proposed punishment of removal from service should be inflicted on him and the said show cause notice spoke of all charges evidence enquiry etc. and Enquiry Officer's finding was also enclosed. The petitioner who has produced 41 documents has not produced the show cause memo, enquiry report or findings of the Enquiry Officer. The respondent has also not produced the charge memo, enquiry notice and the Enquiry proceedings and also the findings of the Enquiry Officer before this Tribunal. But all the above proceedings could be presumed from the pleading and other passed in C.P. No. 67/78 wherein the respondent has contended as follows and the Central Govt. Labour Court has also passed the following order :

"The respondent contends as follows :—The petitioner remained absent from duty from 27-12-1973 without any intimation or prior sanction of the respondent. By his application dt. 31-12-1973 the petitioner requests for grant of sick leave from 28-12-73. By another application dated 9-2-1974 the petitioner requested grant of leave without actually enclosing the medical certificate though he has stated that he was furnishing

the medical certificate. The respondent sent the letter dated 11-2-74 to the petitioner informing him that the medical certificate said to have been enclosed had not been received and asking him to produce it immediately. In response to it, the petitioner produced the medical certificate dated 13-2-1974 for an indefinite period. So by the letter dated 24-9-74 the respondent directed to report to the medical officer of the respondent factory to ascertain whether the petitioner was actually unfit for duty. The said letter was sent by registered post with acknowledgement due and was returned to the respondent with postal endorsement "refused". The respondent's factory received a medical certificate dated 20-4-75 from the Labour Officer on 23-4-75. The Labour Officer forwarded the medical certificate to the management. But the petitioner did not join duty with the fitness certificate as required. The petitioner did not rejoin duty as alleged by him. The respondent never asked the petitioner to obtain the medical certificate with a rubber stamp of the Doctor duly affixed on it. The petitioner was issued with a charge sheet dated 2-11-74 for the offence of unauthorised absence and refusal to accept official letter dated 24-9-74 to the last known address by registered post with acknowledgement due. The said charge sheet was also sent to the petitioner by registered post with acknowledgement due. It was returned undelivered to the respondent with the postal endorsement "not found during delivery time" after having been tried as many as 7 occasions. On 12-12-74, the respondent sent another letter to the petitioner by registered post with acknowledgement due informing him about the appointment of a Court of enquiry. The said letter was returned with the postal endorsement "refused". The Enquiry Officer addressed a letter dated 30-12-74 to the petitioner by registered post with acknowledgement due. It was also returned with the postal endorsement "refused". On 22-1-75 the Enquiry Officer again wrote to the petitioner and that letter was also returned with the postal endorsement "refused". After receipt of the enquiry report from the enquiry officer, the respondent issued a show cause memo dated 14-5-75 to the petitioner proposing the penalty of removal from service. The petitioner received the letter on 15-5-74. He sent reply referring to the Medical certificate dated 20-4-75. He did not give any explanation for the show cause memo. The petitioner had wilfully and with prior knowledge deliberately refused to receive the letter and notices sent by the respondent and the enquiry officer. The respondent had given ample opportunity to the petitioner to submit a fitness certificate and report for duty. Even by the letter dated 26-5-1976 respondent informed the petitioner that he could report for duty within 15 days without prejudice to the

disciplinary action initiated against him. The said letter was also returned by the postal authorities with the endorsement 'left'. Since the petitioner had not informed of any change in his address no action could be taken either to communicate with him or communicate any orders in connection with the disciplinary action. The petitioner never approached the respondent with a request to permit him to join duty. Since the petitioner had not sent any fitness certificate or made any efforts to join duty with fitness certificate, the question of treating the petitioner on duty does not arise inasmuch as the petitioner had avoided to join duty. The payment for the month of December 1978 could not be disbursed as the petitioner had absented himself from duty from 27-12-73 without any prior intimation. The claim of the petitioner for the period he was away from duty is not maintainable as he absented himself from duty without any genuine cause. The petition is to be dismissed.

9. The point for determination is : Whether the petitioner is entitled to the benefits claimed ?

10. The Point : The petitioner sent the letter Ex-R1 dated 31-12-73 for grant of sick leave from 28-12-73 stating that he would furnish the medical certificate at the time of joining. The respondent sent the letter Ex. R-2 dated 6-2-1974 to the petitioner stating that the records reveal that he was absent from duty from 28-12-1973 and that he should report for duty forthwith or in case of sickness to produce a medical certificate mentioning the nature of sickness and the period of leave required. Ex. R-3 dated 9-2-1974 is the letter sent by the petitioner requesting grant of medical leave on the basis of the medical certificate at the time of his joining duty. In reply to Ex. R-3 respondent sent the letter Ex. R-4 dated 11-2-74 stating that the medical certificate said to have been enclosed in Ex. R-3 was not found enclosed and asking him to produce the same immediately. The petitioner sent the medical certificate dated 13-2-1974 for an indefinite period. On receipt of Ex. R-5 the respondent sent the letter Ex. R-6 dated 24-9-1974, to the petitioner stating that he was unauthorisedly absenting himself from duty, that Ex. R-5 was for an indefinite period and that he should report to the medical officer of the factory forthwith. Ex. R-6 is said to have been sent in the envelop Ex. R-7 which has been returned with the endorsement 'refused'. Thereafter the respondent sent the communication Ex. R-16 dated 2-11-1974 to the petitioner of the proposal to hold an enquiry against him. It is said to have been sent in the envelop Ex. R-17 which has been returned with the endorsement "not found". Ex. R-9(a) dated 12-12-1974 which also relates to the enquiry, is said to have been sent to the petitioner in the envelop Ex. R-9 which has been returned with the endorsement 'returned' Ex. R-8 (Ex. R-10) dated 30-12-74 is the communication sent by the enquiry officer to the petitioner asking him to appear for the enquiry on 20-1-75 at the office. It is said to have been sent in the envelop Ex. R-11 which has been returned with the endorsement

"refused". Ex. R-12 dated 22-1-1975 is the Communication sent by the enquiry officer to the petitioner asking him to appear for the enquiry on 20-1-75 at the office. It is said to have been sent in the envelop Ex. R-1 which has been returned with the endorsement 'refused'. Ex. R-12 dated 22-1-75 is the communication sent by the Enquiry Officer to the petitioner asking him to attend the enquiry adjourned to 5-2-75. It is said to have been sent in the envelop Ex. R-13, which has been returned with the endorsement "refused". Then the respondent sent the memorandum Ex. R-14 dated 15-5-75 to the petitioner informing him about the proposed penalty of removal from service and asking him to make any representations in respect of it. The petitioner had received it on 15-5-75 as borne out by the acknowledgement Ex. R-15. On receipt of Ex. R-14, the petitioner sent his communication Ex. P-4 dated 20-5-75 to the respondent asking them to reconsider the matter and allow him to rejoin duty. That has been received by the respondent on 21-5-75 as per Ex. P-5. On receipt of Ex. P-4 the respondent sent the communication Ex. R-18 dated 26-5-1975 to the petitioner asking him to report for duty within 15 days without prejudice to the disciplinary action taken against him and pending finalisation. It is said to have been sent in the envelop Ex. R-19, which has been returned with the endorsement 'left'. After the management had sent Ex. R-12 dt. 22-1-75 which had been returned as borne out by the endorsement Ex. R-13 the petitioner sent the medical certificate. Ex. P-1 dated 20-4-1975 in which the doctor has certified that the petitioner was fit to rejoin duty on 21-4-1975. The management had received it as borne out by Ex. P-2, the endorsement Ex. P-22 and the communication Ex. P-3 between 20-4-75 and 23-4-75. After sending Ex. P-4 dt. 20-5-75, in reply to Ex. R-14, dt. 14-5-75 the petitioner sent the notice Ex. P-6 dt. 31-1-76 which had been received by the respondent as borne out by the acknowledgement Ex. P-7. The petitioner sent another notice Ex. P-3 dated 17-3-76 which had been received by the respondent as borne out by the acknowledgement Ex. P-9. After the management sent Ex. R-18 dt. 26-5-1976 asking the petitioner to report for duty which had been returned as per endorsement in Ex. R-19, the petitioner sent his communication Ex. P-10 dt. 3-12-76 and Ex. P-12 dated 6-4-77 to the respondent. He also sent another notice Ex. P-14 dt. 23-9-77 to the respondent which had been received as per the acknowledgement Ex. P-15. On a scrutiny of the documents filed by both sides, it is seen that the petitioner's permanent address is No. 23, Prakasam Street, Red Hills, Madras-52". The respondent had sent all the communications referred to above to the above address to the petitioner. Amongst those communications, the petitioner had received only Ex. R-2, R-4, and R-14. As discussed earlier all other communications had been returned with some endorsement or another. In Ex. R-3 the petitioner had given his address as No. 23, Devidi Street, Red Hills. In the notices Exs. P-6 and P-8 he has given his address as No. 3-B, Reddipettai Street, Addisonpet, Little Kancheepuram. In his communications Exs. P-10 and P-12 sent subsequent to Exs. P-6 and P-8 he has given his address as No. 28, Narayanaswami Naicken Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12. In the lawyer's notice Ex. P-14 sent subsequent to Exs. P-10

and P-12 the petitioner has given the address which he had given in Ex. P-6 and P-8. It is in the counter and evidence of Thiru D. V. K. Rao (RW-1) that the petitioner had not sent any intimation about the change of address then and there. It is not the contention in the petition of the evidence of the petitioner (PW2) that he had informed the change of address then and there to the respondent. It is clear that the petitioner had not given any intimation to the respondent regarding the change of address pertaining to the various addresses given in Ex. R-2, P-6, P-8, P-10 and P-12. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner PW2 had promoted the medical certificate Ex. R-1 dt. 20-4-75 and had been accepted by the respondent as per Exs. P-2 and P-22, that the doctor (PW1) had certified that PW2 was fit to rejoin from 21-4-75 and the respondent should have called upon the petitioner to rejoin duty either from 21-4-75 or 25-4-75 but has not done so. The learned counsel further content that the communication Ex. s.R6, R.9(a) and R-8, and R-12 relating to the enquiry sent to the petitioner had been returned with some endorsement or other that as those communications had been returned P. W1 had no knowledge of the enquiry, that the respondent should have taken all possible steps to get those communications served on the petitioner, that the respondent instead of sending the communications to the correct address had been sending them to the addresses where PW2 was not residing and that would establish the malafides on the part of the respondent. The learned counsel further contended that the respondent had not sent any reply to the petitioner's notice Exs. P-6 and P-8 and P-14 that RW2 was not aware of the enquiry, the enquiry proceedings are binding on him, that as he had been neither suspended nor terminated from service PW2 continues in the employment and that he is entitled to all the wages claimed in the petition. The learned counsel for the respondent contended that PW2 had not given any change of address at any time that unless he gives any change of address, all the communications had been sent to the originally address given by him. The learned counsel further contended that the respondent has been sending communications to the petitioner asking him to appear for the enquiry that those communications had been returned with the one endorsement or the other, that those communications reveal that the respondent wanted to give a fair chance to the petitioner. He next contended that from the communications sent by the respondent it cannot be said that the respondent prevented the petitioner from joining duty. He also contended that the contentions and the communications sent by the petitioner are to the effect that the respondent is wilfully preventing him from joining duty that those contentions would amount to saying that the respondent denies adjudication of the status of the petitioner would arise as an issue and that the petitioner would have to raise an industrial dispute. He finally contended that in this situation, computation of benefits does not arise and the petitioner cannot be granted the wages for the period of his absence. As pointed out earlier, the petitioner has been sending communications to the respondent giving different addresses for him. He has not informed the change in his address then and there to the respondent. So the respondent has been sending the communications to the address of the petitioner available

in the records of the respondent. Though the petitioner has been giving different addresses as revised by his communications, he had received Exs. R-2, R-4, and R-14 which had been addressed to the petitioner with the address available with the respondent. On a perusal of the communications sent by the respondent, it cannot be said that the respondent want only prevented the petitioner from joining duty. As contended by the learned counsel for the respondents, the contention of the petitioner is to the effect that the respondent want only denies employment to him. It is in the evidence of RW1 that until this day, they have neither suspended nor terminated the services of the petitioner. It is clear that enquiry against the petitioner has not yet been completed and final order passed. As the petitioner appears contend that the management want only denies employment to him, he has to raise an industrial dispute and get the question of non-employment settled. As the materials on record do not reveal that the management want only denies employment to PW2, there is no scope to compute the benefits at this stage. In the situation presented by the facts of this case, the petitioner cannot be granted the benefits claimed." From the pleadings and findings of the Central Govt. Labour Court it could be seen that the petitioner was issued with a charge sheet dated 2-11-74 for the offence of unauthorised absence and refusal to accept the official letter sent to the last known address by registered post. But the same was returned undelivered with the postal endorsement as not found during delivery time as many as on 7 times. Again on 12-12-74 the respondent had sent another letter to the petitioner which was returned with the postal endorsement "refused". The Enquiry officer has sent letter dated 30-12-74 to the petitioner by regd. post which was also returned with Postal endorsement refused. On 22-1-75 also Enquiry Officer sent another letter which was also returned with Postal endorsement 'refused'. Therefore, it is clear that before the enquiry, several letters have been sent by the respondent to the petitioner to his last known address. The Principal Labour Court has commented that the petitioner had been changing his address without intimating the same to his employer. The respondent herein, as found in para 7 of the judgement in C.P. No. 67/78. (Ex. W-24). A perusal of the records available before this Tribunal would show that in Ex. W-6 postal acknowledgement dated 10-5-75, Ex. W-7, Postal acknowledgement dated 13-9-75, Ex. W-8 postal acknowledgement dated 16-9-75 the petitioner has given his address as 23, Prakasam Street, Red Hills, Madras-52. Therefore, it remains clear that at the relevant time of initiating disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner that is from the time of issuing charge sheet dated 2-11-74, and notice sent by the Enquiry officer till January 1975, and memorandum informing about proposed removal from service dated 15-5-75 all have been sent to the address found in Ex. W-6 to W-8 which is the last known address of the petitioner. Charge memo and repeated notice of the Enquiry officer have been returned with the endorsement 'not found' or 'refused'. Therefore, the petitioner cannot now contend that he was not given any opportunity to represent the charge against him. In fact the Enquiry proceedings along with the Enquiry officer's report has been sent to the petitioner while sending it show cause notice proposing a punishment of removal from service and the same has been

received by him on 15-5-75 for which he sent Ex. W-5 letter dated 20-5-75. When the respondent has produced his reply to the show cause notice, the petitioner has not produced the documents received by him from the respondent-management i.e. enquiry proceedings, Enquiry Officer's report and Second show cause notice containing the proposed punishment. After submitting Ex. W-5 letter dated 20-5-75, in his Advocate notice dated 31-1-76 address of the petitioner is mentioned as 3-B, Reddiapatti Street, Addisonpet, Little Kancheepuram. But in his letter dated 3-12-76, about a month earlier than Ex. W-10 letter the petitioner has given his address as 28, Narayanaswamy Naicken Street, Pulianthope, Madras. In Ex. W-16 letter dated 6-4-77, the petitioner has given his residential address as 28, Narayanaswamy Naicken Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12. Ex. W-18, Advocate's notice dated 23-9-78, residential address of the petitioner has been mentioned as 3B, Reddiapatti Street, Addisonpet, Little Kancheepuram. In Ex. M-21 letter dated 20-3-78 sent by the Regional Labour Commissioner, address of the petitioner has been mentioned as 26, Narayanaswamy Naicken Street, Pulianthope, Madras. In Ex. W-22 application before the Central Govt. Labour Court in C.P. 67/79 petitioner has given his address as 26, Narayanaswamy Naicken Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12. In his notice dated 10-3-80 sent by Mr. Stanis Laus Advocate, residential address of the petitioner is given as No. 37, Ammayammal Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12. Ex. W-28 final order has been sent to the address mentioned in Ex. W-25. Ex. W-27 notice issued by the petitioner's counsel which contains the residential address of the petitioner as 37, Ammayammal Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12 is Ex. W-29 letter dated 24-9-80 petitioner has given his residential address as 37, Ammayammal Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12. In his petition before the Labour Court dated 6-11-88 and subsequent proceedings, he has given his address as 16, Nachayamma Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12. As rightly pointed out by the Central Government Labour Court in C.P. 67/78, petitioner has been giving different addresses as 23, Prakasam Street, Red Hills, Madras-52, No. 28-Narayanaswamy Naicken Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12, 3-B, Reddiapatti Street, Addisonpet, Little Kancheepuram, and also 37, Ammayammal Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12 and lastly at No. 16, Nachayamma Street, Pulianthope, Madras-12. However, the fact remains that during the relevant period of domestic enquiry for the unauthorised absence of the petitioner, the charge sheet, enquiry notice and II show cause notice have been sent to his correct address i.e. last known correct address of the petitioner and petitioner himself also has admitted the receipt of the second show cause notice.

11. A perusal of the records would show that by letter dated 31-12-73 petitioner requested sick leave from 28-12-73. By another application dated 9-2-74, petitioner has requested grant of leave without actually enclosing the medical certificate though he has stated that he was furnishing a medical certificate. The respondent has sent a letter dt. 11-12-74 to the petitioner informing him that medical certificate said to have been enclosed had not been received and asking to produce it immediately. The petitioner produced medical certificate dt. 13-2-74 for indefinite period. Therefore, by letter dt. 24-9-74

the respondent has directed the petitioner to report to the Medical Officer of the factory to ascertain whether the petitioner was actually unfit for duty. The said letter has been returned as refused. Thereafter a charge sheet dt. 2-11-74 for unauthorised absence has been issued by the respondent which was also returned undelivered. Subsequent letters dt. 12-12-74, 13-12-74, and 22-1-75 sent by the respondent have also been refused by the petitioner. It is only thereafter the petitioner has come forward with Ex. W-1 Medical certificate dt. 20-4-75 said to have been issued by one Dr. A. S. Johnson. The medical certificate dated 20-4-75 mentions that the petitioner was suffering from fever and dysentery from 26-1-73 and that resulted in mental disorder (mental confusion) and he continued to be under treatment from then onwards. Since in addition to his physical illness he had family worries, the condition of the petitioner kept on worsening during his illness, he was not responsible for his behaviour, after treatment he showed improvement from December 1994, and normal from February 1975 and was steadily normal from then and he was quite fit to rejoin duty from 21-4-75. The averment that the petitioner was suffering from fever and dysentery from 26-1-73 which resulted in mental disorder cannot be true because till 26-12-73. The petitioner was working in the respondent factory normally. He was absent from duty only from 27-12-93. If really the petitioner was suffering from any disease from 26-1-73 as alleged by him, and was under treatment, nothing prevented him from sending leave letters enclosing medical certificates then and there. Petitioner is not an illiterate. A perusal of the various letters sent by him or by his counsel on his instructions would show that the petitioner is quite aware of implications of not sending leave letters. In Ex. W-5 letter which is a reply to the show cause notice, received by him on 15-5-75, the petitioner was able to comment that the enquiry does not indicate anything about his illness and treatment mentioned in the medical certificate given by Dr. A. S. Johnson, and he has further commented that the respondent has overlooked the necessary details. In Ex. W-14 letter dt. 3-12-76 he has again commented about mentioning of medical certificate submitted by him in the proceedings of the Court of enquiry and has also informed the respondent that they have not given due respect to the 20 point programme of the Prime Minister and therefore he will be complaining to the Defence Minister, Prime Minister and President of India. Similarly in Ex. W-16 letter dt. 6-4-77 again he has mentioned about medical certificate produced by him and questioned the Labour Officer of the respondent, whether he is an officer for the labour or a labour to the Officers. In Ex. W-29 letter dt. 24-9-80 sent to the General Manager of the respondent, the petitioner questioned him whether he signs the files after reading the file or signs the files like a rubber stamp by closing his eyes. The earlier medical certificate dt. 13-2-74 produced by the petitioner it is for the period from 28-12-73 to an indefinite period. No employee of any concern whether private or public would send a leave letter or medical certificate for an indefinite period. Therefore, the earlier medical certificate dt. 13-2-74 cannot be a valid medical certificate since the period mentioned in the medical certificate is indefinite. When the management sent a letter dt. 24-9-74 to report to the medical officer of the respondent management about the

submissibility of his joining duty, the petitioner has refused to receive the same. Hereafter the petitioner has submitted Ex. W-1 letter only on 23-4-75, by which time the departmental enquiry for the charge of unauthorised absence against him was already over. Even thereafter the petitioner has not submitted any leave letter for his absence. Even by a letter dt. 26-5-1976 the respondent has directed the petitioner to report for duty within 15 days from the date of receipt of the above said letter without prejudice to the Disciplinary action already initiated against him and which was pending finalisation. The said letter has also been returned with the endorsement 'left' by the postal authorities. As already mentioned, the petitioner has to blame himself for the alleged non-delivery of letters sent to him.

12. The final order removing the petitioner from service has been passed on 10-9-80 and has been received by the petitioner on 12-9-80. But he has raised a dispute only on 6-11-88 about 9 years letter as per Ex. W-31, petition sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner. There is no explanation on the part of the petitioner why he remained silent for nearly 9 years in raising this dispute and the unexplained delay amount to laches on the part of the petitioner.

13. After seeing C.P. 67/78 filed by the petitioner claiming wages of Rs. 29,735.96 from December 1973 to 30-6-78, was dismissed by the Central Govt. Labour Court, the petitioner has filed C.P. 42/80 in the same Court Madras claiming wages for the period from 1-1-78 to 1-6-80 @ Rs. 611.70 p.m. for a total amount of Rs. 14,671.20. In the said claim petition, the contention of the petitioner was that he was not permitted to join duty by the respondent from 21-4-75. But in its order Ex. M.1 dt. 24-12-91, the Central Govt. Labour Court has dismissed the claim petition on the ground that there is no proof that the respondent did not permit the petitioner to join duty and that the respondent is not bound to give any salary to the petitioner. Against the order of the Central Govt. Labour Court, the petitioner has filed W.F. 674/81 before the Hon'ble High Court and the same was transferred to the Central Administrative Tribunal, as T.A. 310/87. The said T.A. 310/87 was dismissed for default on 25-4-88, as seen from Ex. M.2. Thereafter, the said T.A. No. 310/87 was restored and final order was passed on 28-9-88 and the Central Administrative Tribunal has observed as follows :

"In the petition filed by the applicant before the Labour Court, what was claimed by him was salary from 1-12-1975 on the ground that the payment of the same has been withheld unlawfully. The second respondent contended before the Labour Court the circumstances under which the disbursement of salary was not made pointing out the unauthorised absence of the applicant and his refusal to accept the official communications including the one to report the duty. It was also contended that the applicant had never approached the second respondent with a request to permit him to join duty. The second respondent produced the relevant records before the Labour Court to establish the contention. From a perusal of the

various communications sent by the second respondent, the Labour Court came to the conclusion that it cannot be said that the applicant was want only prevented from joining duty. Hence it was held that the applicant not entitled to receive from the second respondent any benefit capable of being computed in terms of money. The conclusion of the Labour Court is perfectly warranted and in accordance with law."

The said Judgement of the Central Administrative Tribunal is Ex. W-1. The Central Government Labour Court as well as Central Administrative Tribunal have categorically held that the respondent management did not prevent the petitioner from joining duty, but on the other hand the respondent management has proved that the petitioner was unauthorisedly absent. A perusal of all the records would show that the petitioner was unauthorisedly absent and attempted to avoid the charge memo and enquiry notices which were sent during his absent period and when second show cause notice was about to be issued to him he has obtained a medical certificate Ex. W-1 and on the strength of this medical certificate he wants to build his case that fault lies with the management, that he was always ready and willing to join duty, but the management only prevented him from joining duty. The above said contention of the petitioner is totally unsustainable on the face of the records.

14. In the result, award passed dismissing the claim of the petitioner. No costs.

Dated, this the 31st day of May, 1999.

THIRU S. ASHOK KUMAR, Industrial Tribunal
WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Workman : NIL.

For Management : NIL.

DOCUMENTS MARKED

- Ex. W. 1 20-4-75 Medical Certificate of Dr. Johnson.
- Ex. W. 2 21-4-75 Letter from the Labour Bureau to the petitioner.
- Ex. W. 3 23-4-75 Endorsement of the Gate-keeper.
- Ex. W. 4 23-4-75 Letter from the Labour Officer.
- Ex. W. 5 20-5-75 Letter from the petitioner to the respondent.
- Ex. W. 6 21-5-75 Acknowledgement.
- Ex. W. 7 13-9-75 Acknowledgment from the respondent.
- Ex. W. 8 16-9-75 Acknowledgement of the Labour Officer to the reminder of the petitioner.
- Ex. W. 9 6-10-75 Certificate of posting.
- Ex. W. 10 31-1-76 Petitioner's counsel notice to the respondent.

- Ex. W. 11 2-2-76 Acknowledgement.
 Ex. W. 12 17-3-76 Reminder Notice.
 Ex. W. 13 27-3-76 Acknowledgement.
 Ex. W. 14 3-12-76 Letter from the petitioner to the respondent.
 Ex. W. 15 4-12-76 Certificate of Posting.
 Ex. W. 16 6-4-77 Letter from the petitioner to the Labour Officer.
 Ex. W. 17 20-4-77 Certificate of posting.
 Ex. W. 18 23-9-77 Petitioner's counsel notice to the respondent.
 Ex. W. 19 24-9-77 Acknowledgement.
 Ex. W. 20 6-2-78 Letter from the Labour Officer, Chengalpet.
 Ex. W. 21 20-3-78 Reply from the Regional Labour Commissioner, Madras-6.
 Ex. W. 22 16-9-78 Claim petition in C.P. 67/78.
 Ex. W. 23 2-3-78 Petitioner's counsel letter to the Respondent's Counsel.
 Ex. W. 24 7-2-80 Order in C.P. No. 67/78.
 Ex. W. 25 10-3-80 Petitioner's counsel notice to the respondent.
 Ex. W. 26 11-3-80 Acknowledgement.
 Ex. W. 27 9-5-80 Reminder notice.
 Ex. W. 28 10-9-80 Removal Order.
 Ex. W. 29 24-9-80 Petitioner representation to the respondent.
 Ex. W. 30 3-10-80 Acknowledgement.
 Ex. W. 31 6-11-88 Petition filed under Section 2A of the I.D. Act before the Regional Labour Commr., Madras-6.
 Ex. W. 32 11-9-91 Memo filed by the petitioner.
 Ex. W. 33 27-4-92 Letter from the petitioner to the Regional Labour Commissioner, Madras-6.
 Ex. W. 34 28-4-92 Acknowledgement.
 Ex. W. 35 14-12-92 Proceedings of the Conciliation Officer Failure report.
 Ex. W. 36 17-3-94 Proceedings of the Conciliation Officer.
 Ex. W. 37 12-7-94 Petitioner's representation for the Government of India.
 Ex. W. 38 12-9-94 Acknowledgement.

- Ex. W. 39 21-7-95/4-8-75 Order of reference.
 Ex. W. 40 28-8-85 Letter from the petitioner to the Labour Court, Madras.
 Ex. W. 41 28-9-88 Judgement of C.A.T. in T.A. 310/87.

DOCUMENTS BY MANAGEMENT

- Ex. M. 1 24-12-91 Labour Court, Chennai Judgement in I.D. 42/80.
 Ex. M. 2 25-4-83 T.A. 310/87 order of CAT—Madras.

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2568.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डिबीजनल इंजीनियर, टेसीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन), नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्धन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[(सं० 40012/3/92-आई०आर० (डी०यू०)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2568.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Divisional Engineer Telecom. Railway Electrification, New Delhi and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-40012/3/92-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

न्यायाधीश, औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण/केन्द्रीय/कोटा/राज०/

निर्देश प्रकरण क्रमांक : औ० न्या० (केन्द्रीय)—4/93

दिनांक स्थापित : 1-1-93

प्रसंग : भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के आदेश सं० एल० 40012/3/92-आई०आर० (डी०यू०) दि० 28-12-92

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

मध्य

घांसीराम पुत्र श्री मण्डूराम द्वारा श्री दिनेशराय त्रिवेदी, एण्ड०, 117, प्रतापनगर, दादाबाड़ी, कोटा।

—प्राथी श्रमिक

एवं

डिवीजनल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकेशन),
बी-1/10, कम्युनिटी सेंटर, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली—110058

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थित

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा,

आर. एच. जे. एम.

प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि :

श्री दिनेशराय द्विवेदी

प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि:

श्री सी. बी. सोरन

अधिनिर्णय दिनांक : 1-6-99

अधिनिर्णय

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा निम्न
निर्देश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (जिसे तदुपरान्त
“अधिनियम” से सम्बोधित किया जायेगा) की धारा 10(1)
(घ) के अन्तर्गत इस न्यायाधिकरण को अधिनिर्णयार्थ
सम्प्रेषित किया गया है :—

“Whether the action of Telecom Deptt., R. E. in
terminating the services of Shri Ghasi Ram
s/o Jhandu Ram labour at their Sub-Division,
Sawaimadhopur, w.e.f. 1-9-88 is justified ?
If not, what relief he is entitled to ?”

2. निर्देश न्यायाधिकरण में प्राप्त होने पर वर्ज
रजिस्टर किया गया व पक्षकारों को सूचना जारी की
गयी। प्रार्थी श्रमिक घासीराम की ओर से क्लेम स्टेटमेंट
प्रस्तुत कर संक्षेप में यह अभिकथित किया गया है कि
प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजनल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम
(रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकेशन) बी-1/10, कम्युनिटी सेंटर, जनकपुरी,
नई दिल्ली-110058 (जिसे तदुपरान्त “प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक” से
सम्बोधित किया जावेगा,) के यहां नियोजन में, प्रतिपक्षी
नियोजक के अधीन रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकेशन डिवि. सवाई-
माधोपुर पर नियोजित होकर नव. 86 से 31-8-88 तक
निरन्तर कार्य किया गया है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा
प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि. 1-9-88 से बिना समुचित सरकार
से पूर्व-स्वीकृति प्राप्त किये, प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ रहे
श्रमिकों को यथावत कार्य पर नियोजित रखते हुये, बिना
एक माह का नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छंटनी का
मुआवजा दिये अथवा प्रस्तावित किये अधिनियम की
धारा 25-एन, एफ व जी के आकात्मक प्रावधानों की
अवहेलना करते हुये अनुचित व अवैध प्रकार से सेवा से
पृथक कर दिया गया जो सेवा पृथक अधिनियम के अधीन
प्रार्थी श्रमिक की सेवा से छंटनी भी रही है जब प्रार्थी
श्रमिक अधिनियम के अधीन प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां
नियोजन में सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पिछले सम्पूर्ण वेतन
व देय अन्य समस्त लाभों सहित पुनः सेवा पर बहाल
करवाये जाने का अधिकारी रहा है। अतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक
का प्रस्तुत क्लेम अस्वीकार किया जावे।

3. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब क्लेम
स्टेटमेंट प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त क्लेम को
अस्वीकार किया गया है तथा प्रतिवाब स्वरूप यह अभि-
कथित किया गया है कि टेलीकॉम (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण
परियोजना) का विभाग अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत परिभाषित
“उद्योगों” नहीं रहा है तब अधिनियम के प्रावधान
प्रतिपक्षी विभाग पर प्रभावी नहीं रहे हैं। प्रतिपक्षी, प्रार्थी
श्रमिक का “नियोजक” नहीं रहा है बल्कि तत्कालीन सहायक
अभियन्ता ही नियोजक रहा है जिसे प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा
पक्षकार नहीं बनाया गया है। आगे यह भी अभिकथित
किया गया है कि रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना के अन्तर्गत
रेलवे लाईनों के विद्युतीकरण के कारण कार्य कर रही
टेलीकॉम लाईनों को इन्डेशन जोन से दूर करने का कार्य
किया जाता है जो कार्य पूर्णतया अस्थायी एवं समयबद्ध
रहता है और उक्त कार्य पूर्ण होने पर परियोजना का
कार्य समाप्त हो जाता है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का कार्य भी
स्वतः समाप्त हो जाता है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की उक्त
परियोजना 2 वर्ष से कम अवधि की रही है तब अधिनियम
की धारा 25-एफ. एफ. एफ. 3-बी(2) में शासित होता है
और प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ का लाभ
प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहता है। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण
में प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की उक्त परियोजना विशेष का कार्य
अक्टू. 85 से जुलाई, 87 तक 2 वर्ष से कम अवधि तक
चला है जिस परियोजना की समाप्ति पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक
का कार्य स्वतः समाप्त हो गया है और उसे माननीय
उच्चतम न्यायालय के निर्देशानुसार अन्यत्र भी नहीं भेजा
जा सकता। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को
कभी सेवा से पृथक भी नहीं किया गया है वरन् प्रार्थी
श्रमिक द्वारा कार्य समाप्त होने पर स्वतः स्वेच्छा से
सेवा का त्याग किया गया है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का मामला
सेवा से छंटनी का भी नहीं रहा है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा
अपना यह विवाद भी असधारण विलम्ब से उठाया गया
है तब वह कोई राहत भी प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी
नहीं रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक के
मामले में अधिनियम के अधीन किसी भी प्रावधान की
अवहेलना नहीं की गयी है। अतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक का
प्रस्तुत क्लेम अस्वीकार किया जाकर निरस्त किया जावे।

4. प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा जवाबजवाब प्रस्तुत कर
संक्षेप में यह अभिकथित किया गया है कि प्रार्थी द्वारा
प्रतिपक्षी विभाग के सब डिवीजन सवाईमाधोपुर में कार्य
किया गया है जो डिवीजन बाद में नाम परिवर्तित करते
हुए अन्यत्र स्थानान्तरित कर दिया गया है और उसका
समस्त कार्य प्रतिपक्षी को हस्तांतरित कर दिया गया
है इसी कारण प्रतिपक्षी को पक्षकार बनाया गया है।
प्रतिपक्षी ही प्रार्थी श्रमिक के नियोजन के समस्त दायित्वों
व अधिकारों का वहन करता है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग का
कार्य उद्योग की परिभाषा में आता है तथा प्रार्थी भी
एक कर्मकार है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग के रेलवे विद्युतीकरण
परियोजना का कार्य वर्तमान में भी जारी है और उस

पर कार्य पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ श्रमिक अभी भी उक्त मूल प्रतिपक्षी विभाग में सेवारत है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की कोई भी रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना 2 वर्ष की अवधि में भी पूर्ण नहीं हुई है तथा प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत प्रकरण अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ के प्रावधानों से शासित होता है न कि धारा 25-एफ.एफ.एफ. 3-बी (2) से। अतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक को अपने क्लेम स्टेटमेंट में वर्णित राहत प्रदान की जावे।

5. प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से मौखिक साक्ष्य में स्वयं प्रार्थी चासीराम का शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिस पर प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा प्रतिपरीक्षा की गयी है। प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य में प्रलेख प्रवर्ष डब्ल्यू. 1 लगा. डब्ल्यू. 4 तक प्रस्तुत कर प्रदर्शित करवाये गये हैं जिनका यथासमय उल्लेख किया जावेगा। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से मौखिक साक्ष्य में साक्षी शिवाजी उपाध्याय उप मण्डल अभियंता टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन) दिल्ली का शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिस पर प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रतिपरीक्षा की गयी है। प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य में प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा श्रम समक्षता अधिकांश के यहां प्रस्तुत शिकाया प्रार्थना-पत्र दि. 23-11-90 की फोटोप्रति प्रस्तुत की गयी है।

6. मैंने दोनों पक्षों के विद्वान प्रतिनिधिगण की बहस सुनी जो बहस उनके उक्त अभिवक्तियों के अनुरूप ही रही है। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा अपनी बहस के समर्थन में माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "ए.आई.आर. 1995 एस.सी. 1163—हिन्दुस्तान स्टील वर्क्स कंस्ट्रक्शन लिमि. बनाम हिन्दुस्तान स्टील वर्क्स कंस्ट्रक्शन लि. एम्पलो-ईज, यूनियन, हैदराबाद एवं अन्य, माननीय राज. उच्च न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "1193 लेब. आई.सी. 678—दिनेश कुमार बनाम यूनियन आफ इण्डिया एवं अन्य एवं माननीय पंजाब एवं हरियाणा उच्च न्यायालय की पूर्ण पीठ का न्यायदृष्टांत 1979 लेब. आई.सी. 12—मुन्दर सिंह बनाम बेस कंस्ट्रक्शन बोर्ड, न्यू दिल्ली एवं अन्य" को उद्धृत किया गया है। इसके प्रतिवाद में विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "ए.आई.आर. 1999 एस.सी. 355—लाल मोहम्मद एवं अन्य बनाम इण्डियन रेलवे कंस्ट्रक्शन कंपनी लिमि. एवं अन्य" को उद्धृत किया गया है।

7. मैंने दोनों पक्षकारों के विद्वान प्रतिनिधिगण की बहस पर विचार किया तथा उद्धृत उक्त न्यायदृष्टांतों में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धांतों व अभिमतों पर तथा पदावली व अभिलेख पर ध्यानपूर्वक अवलोकन व मनन किया।

8. क्लेम समर्थन में मौखिक साक्ष्य में प्रस्तुत शपथ-पत्र पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अपने नियोजनकाल व कार्यदिवसों के सन्दर्भ में यह मुख्यतः साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां माह नवम्बर, 86 से नियोजित होकर 31-8-88 तक निरन्तर कार्य किया है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपनी साक्ष्य के समर्थन में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रार्थी श्रमिक को जारी उसके नियोजनकाल व

कार्यदिवसों के प्रमाणित कार्य विवरण-पत्र प्रलेख प्रदर्श डब्ल्यू. 2 लगा. डब्ल्यू. 4 प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रस्तुत कर प्रदर्शित करवाये गये हैं, जिनके अवलोकन पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा यह प्रमाणित किया गया है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा माह नवम्बर, 86 से माह अगस्त, 88 तक की नियोजनावधि में कुल 631 दिवस कार्य किया गया है जिन कार्य दिवसों का माहवार विवरण भी अंकित किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब क्लेम प्रस्तुत कर व प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा साक्ष्य में अपना शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त कथित नियोजनकाल व कार्य दिवसों का प्रतिवाद भी नहीं किया गया है और न ही खण्डन में कोई प्रलेखी साक्ष्य ही प्रस्तुत की गयी है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की उक्त मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य से यह पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां नियोजनकाल माह नवम्बर, 86 से माह अगस्त, 88 तक का रहा है और प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा उक्त नियोजनकाल में प्रत्येक 12 कलेण्डर माह में 240 दिवस सेवा कार्य पूर्ण कर कम से कम निरन्तर एक वर्ष की सेवा पूर्ण की गयी है।

9. प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अपनी सेवा मुक्ति के सन्दर्भ में आगे शपथ-पत्र पर मुख्यतः यह साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि. 1-9-88 से प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ श्रमिकगण मुरलीधर व श्रीलाल को यथावत सेवा पर नियोजित रखते हुए बिना एक माह का नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छुट्टी का मुआवजा दिये अथवा प्रस्तावित किये अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ. जी. के आन्तरिक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुए अनुचित व अवैध प्रकार से सेवा से पृथक् कर दिया गया। आगे यह साक्ष्य भी रही है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ रहे उक्त दोनों श्रमिकगण वर्तमान में भी प्रतिपक्षी विभाग में कार्यरत रहे हैं। इसके विपरीत प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की शपथ-पत्र पर इस सन्दर्भ में वैधानिक आपत्ति के अतिरिक्त यह साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को कभी भी सेवा से पृथक् नहीं किया गया है वरन् प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा स्वतः स्वेच्छा से कार्य समाप्ति पर सेवा त्याग किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक साक्षी द्वारा शपथ-पत्र पर यह स्वीकार किया गया है कि उसके द्वारा शपथ-पत्र अभिलेख व उपलब्ध एकीकृत जानकारी के आधार पर दिया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा अपनी उक्त साक्ष्य के समर्थन में प्रार्थी श्रमिक का स्वतः स्वेच्छा से सेवा त्याग के सन्दर्भ में कोई सेवा त्याग-पत्र, उपस्थित रजिस्टर इन्द्राजात, कार्यालय टिप्पणी आदि कोई प्रलेख प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है तब प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की उक्त साक्ष्य व्यक्तिगत जानकारी न होने के आधार पर व अभिलेख की समर्थित साक्ष्य के अभाव में स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं रहती है जब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की शपथ-पत्र पर रही उक्त अखण्डित मौखिक साक्ष्य से यह भी पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि. 1-9-88 से सेवा से पृथक् किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी का शपथ-पत्र पर ऐसी साक्ष्य भी नहीं रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को

सेवा से पृथक् करने समय अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ की परिपालना की गयी है तथा सेवा पृथक् करने में पूर्व ओ. वि. नियमों के नियम 77 के अनुसार प्रार्थी श्रमिक संवर्ग की कोई वरिष्ठता सूची का प्रकाशन किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा शपथ-पत्र की साक्ष्य पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा कथित कनिष्ठ श्रमिकगण मुरलीधर व श्रीलाल वर्तमान तक यथावत नियोजित रहने का भी स्पष्टतः प्रतिवाद नहीं किया गया है। इस सन्दर्भ में शपथ-पत्र की प्रतिपरीक्षा पर यह कथन भी किया गया है कि साक्षी को यह पता नहीं है कि मुरलीधर व श्रीलाल श्रमिकगण ने प्रतिपक्षी विभाग में काम किया हो और वे अब भी कार्यरत रहे हों तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अग्रगण्यता रही साक्ष्य से यह भी पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को सेवा से पृथक् करने समय अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ, जी व ओ. वि. नियमों के नियम 77 के आजात्मक प्रावधानों की परिपालना नहीं की गयी है।

10. प्रमाणित उक्त तथ्यों पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रथम यह वैधानिक आपत्ति रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकॉम विभाग, अधिनियम के अधीन परिभाषित एक "उद्योग" नहीं रहा है तब प्रतिपक्षी विभाग पर अधिनियम के प्रावधान प्रभावी नहीं होते हैं। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय द्वारा अपने न्यायदृष्टान्त "ए० आई०आर० 1998 एस०सी० 656—जनरल मैनेजर, टेलीकॉम बनाम एस० श्रीनिवासराय व अन्य" के मामले में उक्त बिन्दु पर पूर्व में रहे विवाद को समाप्त करते हुए यह स्पष्टतः प्रतिपादित कर दिया गया है कि टेलीकॉम विभाग अधिनियम के धारा 2(ज) में परिभाषित एक "उद्योग" रहा है, वह व्यावसायिक कार्यों का निष्पादन करता है और उसके द्वारा सरकार के किसी सम्प्रभुता के कार्य का निष्पादन नहीं किया जाता है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

11. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से द्वितीय यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन प्रार्थी श्रमिक का नियोजक नहीं रहा है बल्कि नियोजक सन-डिवीजन, सवाईमाधोपुर रहा है जिसे प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा पक्षकार नहीं बनाया गया है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत क्लेम मात्र इस आधार पर ही निरस्तनीय रहा है। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से उक्त सन्दर्भ में जवाबुलजवाब प्रस्तुत कर यह कथन रहे हैं कि सवाईमाधोपुर स्थित डिवीजन को परिवर्तित कर प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन बना दिया गया है और प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन ही पूर्व में रहे सवाईमाधोपुर डिवीजन के समस्त अधिकार व उत्तरदायित्व का निर्वहन कर रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त कथनों के खण्डन में सवाईमाधोपुर डिवीजन के समापन व

प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन के निर्माण सम्बन्धी कोई प्रत्यक्ष प्रस्तुत नहीं किये गये हैं तब प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

12. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से तृतीय यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक के नियोजक रहे सवाईमाधोपुर डिवीजन का अन्दर अवधि दो वर्ष कार्य समाप्त हो जाने पर क्लोजर हो गया है जो उक्त डिवीजन का क्लोजर अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०ए० (1) के अन्तर्गत (बी) के अन्तर्गत व धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ० (2) के अन्तर्गत रहा है तब प्रतिपक्षी विभाग के लिए उक्त सवाईमाधोपुर डिवीजन के क्लोजर के लिए संपुर्ण सरकार से पूर्व स्वीकृति लिया जाना व सेवा से छंटनी से पूर्व अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ (बी) की परिपालना किया जाना वैधानिक रूप में आवश्यक नहीं रहा है। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा उक्त सन्दर्भ में माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टान्त "ए०आई०आर० 1995 एस० सी० 1163, माननीय राज० उच्च न्यायालय का न्याय-दृष्टान्त 1993 लेब० आई०सी० 678— व माननीय पंजाब एवं हरियाणा उच्च न्यायालय की पूर्ण पीठ का न्यायदृष्टान्त 1979 लेब०आई०सी० 12" उद्धृत भी किये गये हैं। प्रतिवाद में प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी की ओर से माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टान्त "ए०आई०आर० 1999 एस०सी० 355" भी उद्धृत किया गया है। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०ए० (1) के प्रावधानानुसार यदि नियोजक अपनी किसी अण्डरटेकिंग का क्लोजर चाहता है तब उसे निर्धारित प्रक्रिया पर कम से कम 60 दिवस पूर्व समुचित सरकार को नोटिस दिया जाना आवश्यक रहता है। उक्त धारा के परन्तुक (बी) में यह अन्वय भी रहा है कि उक्त कथित नोटिस ऐसी अण्डरटेकिंग जो भवनों, पुलों, सड़कों, नहरों, बांधों और ऐसी परियोजनाओं के अन्य निर्माण कार्यों का कार्य करती है, के क्लोजर होने पर दिया जाना आवश्यक नहीं रहेगा। अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ० (1) में यह प्रावधानित रहा है कि जब कोई अण्डरटेकिंग किसी भी कारण से क्लोज-डाउन की जायेगी तब उस अण्डरटेकिंग में कार्यरत रहे ऐसे श्रमिक जिनके द्वारा कम से कम एक वर्ष की निरन्तर पूर्ण सेवा कर ली गयी है, वे अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ० के अनुसार नोटिस अथवा नोटिस बेतन व छंटनी का मुआवजा प्राप्त करने के अधिकारी रहेंगे। उक्त धारा 25-एफ०एफ० (2) में यह प्रावधानित रहा है कि ऐसी अण्डरटेकिंग जो भवनों, पुलों, सड़कों, नहरों व बांधों व ऐसे अन्य निर्माण कार्य करती है और उनका उक्त कार्य अन्दर अवधि 2 वर्ष समाप्त हो जाने पर उनका क्लोजर होना है तब हा अण्डरटेकिंग में कार्यरत श्रमिक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ(बी) के अन्तर्गत मुआवजा प्राप्त करने के अधिकारी नहीं रहते हैं। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब क्लेम प्रस्तुत कर यह तो अभिकथित किया गया है

कि प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकॉम (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण) परियोजना का कार्य रेलवे लाइनों के विद्युतीकरण के कारण रेलवे लाइनों के साथ-साथ काम कर रही टेलीकॉम लाइनों को इण्डेक्शन जोन से सेफर जोन में स्थानान्तरित करने का रहा है। यह टेलीकॉम लाइनों का स्थानान्तरण किस प्रकार से निर्माण कार्य रहा है, इस सन्दर्भ में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से कोई मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है तब साक्ष्य विशेष के अभाव में टेलीकॉम लाइनों को इण्डेक्शन जोन से सेफर जोन में स्थानान्तरित किया जाना किसी भी प्रकार में उपरोक्त प्रावधित निर्माण कार्य होना नहीं पाया जाता है। प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकॉम विभाग द्वारा किये जाने वाला उक्त कार्य समाप्त हो गया, इस सन्दर्भ में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से कोई साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है। इनके विपरीत प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन स्वयं उक्त कार्य के लिए वर्तमान तक भी विद्यमान रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से इस सन्दर्भ में कोई मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है कि प्रतिपक्षी विभाग का सर्वाध्याधोपुर डिवीजन का कार्य कम प्रारम्भ होकर कम समाप्त हुआ और सर्वाध्याधोपुर डिवीजन उक्त कार्य के लिए एक स्वतन्त्र परियोजना बनाई रही है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में कथित उक्त परियोजना संबंधी कोई प्रलेख व्यापककरण के समक्ष प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है। उभयपक्षों द्वारा उद्धृत उक्त न्यायदृष्टान्तों के भागले में नियोजक की ओर से कथित परियोजनाओं में सम्बन्धित समस्त प्रलेखों को प्रस्तुत किया गया है तब उक्त प्रलेखों के विवेचनोपपन्न उद्धृत उक्त निर्णयों में माननीय न्यायालयों द्वारा न्यायसिद्धान्त व अभिमत प्रकट किये गये हैं। इस न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उक्त सन्दर्भ में कोई प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है तब साक्ष्य के अभाव में उक्त न्यायदृष्टान्तों में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्त व अभिमत इस प्रकरण के लिए सुसंगत नहीं रहे हैं। इस प्रकार उक्त तथ्यात्मक एवं वैधानिक विवेचनोपरान्त प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०ए०(1) के अपवाद (बी) व अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ०(2) का लाभ प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना नहीं पाया जाता है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

13. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से चतुर्थ यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा यह विवाद सेवा पृथक की तिथि 1-9-88 के लगभग 2 वर्ष पश्चात् दि० 13-11-90 के बाद असाधारण विलम्ब से उठाया गया है तब वह उक्त विवाद में कोई राहत प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहा है। मैंने इस वैधानिक आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। अधिनियम व उसके अधीन बनाये गये नियमों के अन्तर्गत विवाद प्रस्तुत किये जाने की कोई समयवधि निश्चित नहीं की हुई है तब भी माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय के न्यायदृष्टान्त "ए०आई०आर० 1959 एम०सी०

1217—मै० शालीमार वर्से लिमि० बनाम उनके श्रमिकगण" में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्त अनुसार विवाद युक्तियुक्त समयावधि में ही प्रस्तुत किया जाना चाहिए। माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय द्वारा अपने न्यायदृष्टान्त "(1977) 2 एम०सी० सी० 705—कोक्स एण्ड किंग्स (ऐजेन्ट्स) लिमि० बनाम उनके श्रमिकगण" में उनके मतक्ष रहे ऐसे मामले में जिनमें विवाद सन् 1966 में उत्पन्न हुआ था और 1966 में ही श्रम समझौता अधिकारी के समक्ष मामला प्रस्तुत कर दिया गया था किन्तु कुछ तकनीकी दोष रहने पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक को नोटिस दि० 25-10-72 को तामील करवाये जाने पर श्रमिक के विवाद को 6 वर्ष के असाधारण विलम्ब में प्रस्तुत किया जाना मानते हुए उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का पिछला वेतन नहीं दिलवाये जाने का अभिमत प्रकट किया गया। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में अभिलेख पर यह प्रकट हुआ है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपना यह विवाद सर्वप्रथम सेवा पृथक की तिथि 1-9-88 के लगभग 2 वर्ष पश्चात् दि० 23-11-90 के बाद असाधारण विलम्ब में उठाया गया है जिसकी की पुष्टि स्वयं प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अभिलेख पर प्रस्तुत जिलाजन्त-प्रार्थनापत्र दिनांकित 23-11-90 से भी होती है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक उक्त न्यायदृष्टान्तों में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्तों के प्रकाश में उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का कोई पिछला वेतन प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना नहीं रहता है जब मात्र इस आधार पर उम्मा यह क्वेम निरस्तनीय नहीं रहता है तथा प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति को भी उक्त प्रकार में निर्णीत किया जाता है। इस प्रकार साक्ष्य के उक्त विवेचनोपरान्त प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि० 1-9-88 से अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०, जी० व बो०वि० नियमों के नियम 77 के आशात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुए सेवा से पृथक किया जाना किसी भी प्रकार में उचित एवं वैध होना नहीं पाया जाता है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम के प्रावधानान्तर्गत प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहाँ नियोजन में सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पुनः सेवा पर बहाल कर्वाये जाने का अधिकारी होना भी पाया जाता है।

14. अब जहाँ तक प्रार्थी श्रमिक के पिछले वेतन को प्राप्त करने के अधिकार का प्रश्न है, प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से बोग स्टेटमेन्ट में सेवा पृथक पश्चात् बेरोजगार रहने सम्बन्धी कोई अभिकथन नहीं रहे हैं तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रस्तुत जवाब में भी इस सम्बन्धी कोई प्रतिवाद नहीं रहा है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक की सर्वप्रथम अपने शपथपत्र पर यह साक्ष्य रही है कि वह नौकरी समाप्त होने के बाद से लगातार बेरोजगार है, काम ढूँढ़ने का प्रयास किया, ट्रेनिंग आदि भी की परन्तु अभी तक कोई रोजगार प्राप्त नहीं हुआ तब शपथपत्र की प्रतिपरीक्षा पर यह स्पष्ट स्वीकारोक्ति भी रही है कि वह खड़े खोदकर काम चलाता है और 12-13 रु० रोज मिल जाते हैं। इस प्रकार प्रार्थी श्रमिक की साक्ष्यानुसार ही प्रार्थी श्रमिक सेवा पृथक अवधि में आंशिक रूप से अल्पतः लाभकारी नियोजित भी रहा है तब प्रस्तुत तथ्यों एवं समस्त परिस्थितियों को दृष्टिगत रखते

हुए प्रार्थी श्रमिक पिछले वेतन स्वरूप 30% वेतन ही प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना पाया जाता है जो पिछला वेतन वो दि० 23-11-90 से प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी रहेगा।

15. अतः उक्त सम्पूर्ण विवेचन के आधार पर भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा सम्प्रेषित निर्देश को इस प्रकार उत्तरित किया जाता है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक डिवीजनल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन), बी-1/10, कम्युनिटी सेन्टर, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक घासीराम को दिनांक 1-9-88 से सेवा से पृथक् करना उचित एवं वैध नहीं है, फलस्वरूप प्रार्थी श्रमिक अपनी सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पुनः सेवा में आने का अधिकारी घोषित किया जाता है। चूंकि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा सेवा से पृथक् की तिथि 1-9-88 के लगभग 2 वर्ष पश्चात् दि० 23-11-90 को विलम्ब से विवाद उठाया गया है, अतः प्रकरण की परिस्थितियों में प्रार्थी श्रमिक उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का कोई वेतन प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा व तदुपरान्त दि० 23-11-90 से पिछले वेतन स्वरूप 30% वेतन ही प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होगा।

इस अधिनिर्णय को समुचित सरकार को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाया जावे।

जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2569—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डिवीजनल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम, रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन, नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-40012/13/92-आई०आर० (डो०यू०)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2569.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Divisional Engineer Telecom, Railway Electrification, New Delhi and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-40012/13/92-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

न्यायाधीश, औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण/केन्द्रीय/कोटा/राज०/

निर्देश प्रकरण क्रमांक : औ० न्या० (केन्द्रीय)—6/93

दिनांक स्थापित : 22-1-93

2564 GI/99—28.

प्रसंग : भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के आदेश क्रमांक 40012/13/92-आई०आर० (डो०यू०) दि० 18-1-93

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

मध्य

केहर सिंह पुत्र श्री जगदाम

—प्रार्थी श्रमिक

एवं

डिवीजनल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन), बी-1/10, कम्युनिटी सेन्टर, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली-110058

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थित

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा,

आर०एव०जे०एम०

प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि

श्री एन० के० तिवारी

प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि

श्री सी० बी० सोरल

अधिनिर्णय दिनांक : 1-6-99

अधिनिर्णय

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा निम्न निर्देश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (जिसे तदुपरान्त "अधिनिर्णय" में सम्बोधित किया जावेगा) की धारा 10 (1)(घ) के अन्तर्गत इस न्यायाधिकरण का अधिनिर्णयार्थ सम्प्रेषित किया गया है।—

"Whether the action of Telecom (RE) in terminating the services of Shri Kehar Singh, s/o Sh. Jagam, Labour at Swainadhpor and Kota w.e.f. 1-6-87 is legal and justified? If not what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. निर्देश न्यायाधिकरण में प्राप्त होने पर दर्ज रजिस्टर किया गया व पक्षकारों को सूचना जारी की गयी। प्रार्थी श्रमिक केहर सिंह की ओर से ब्रोस स्टेटमेंट प्रस्तुत कर संक्षेप में यह उभिकथित किया गया है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजनल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन), बी-1/10, कम्युनिटी सेन्टर, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली-110058 (जिसे तदुपरान्त "प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक" में सम्बोधित किया जावेगा) के यहां निोजन में, प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के अधीन रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन परियोजना, सवाई-साधोपुर पर मह अक्टूबर, 85 से नियोजित होकर दि० जनवरी, 87 तक एवं तदुपरान्त सवाईसाधोपुर से कोटा स्थानान्तरित होकर फर० 87 से मई, 87 तक निरन्तर कार्य किया गया है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि० 1-6-87 से बिना समुचित सरकार से पूर्व

स्वीकृति प्राप्त किये, प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ रहे श्रमिकों को यथावत् कार्य पर नियोजित रखते हुए, बिना एक माह का नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छंटनी का मुआवजा दिये अथवा प्रस्तावित किये अधिनियम की धारा 25-एन, एफ व जी के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुए अनुचित व अवैध प्रकार से सेवा से पृथक कर दिया गया जो सेवा पृथक अधिनियम के अधीन प्रार्थी श्रमिक की सेवा से छंटनी भी रही है जब प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम के अधीन प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां नियोजन में सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पिछले सम्पूर्ण वेतन व देय अन्य समस्त लाभों सहित पुनः सेवा पर बहाल करवाये जाने का अधिकारी रहा है। अतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत क्लेम सव्यय स्वीकार किया जावे।

3. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब क्लेम स्टेटमेंट प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त क्लेम को अस्वीकार किया गया है तथा प्रतिवाद स्वरूप यह अभिकथित किया गया है कि टेलीकॉम (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना) का विभाग अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत परिभाषित "उद्योग" नहीं रहा है तब अधिनियम के प्रावधान प्रतिपक्षी विभाग पर प्रभावी नहीं रहे हैं। प्रतिपक्षी प्रार्थी श्रमिक का, "नियोजक" नहीं रहा है बल्कि विभिन्न सहायक अभियन्ता ही नियोजक रहे हैं। जिन्हें प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा पक्षकार नहीं बनाया गया है। आगे यह भी अभिकथित किया गया है कि रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना के अन्तर्गत रेलवे लाइनों के विद्युतीकरण के कारण कार्य कर रही टेलीकॉम लाइनों को इण्डेक्शन जोन से दूर करने का कार्य किया जाता है जो कार्य पूर्णतया अस्थायी एवं समयबद्ध रहता है और उक्त कार्य पूर्ण होने पर परियोजना का कार्य समाप्त हो जाता है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का कार्य भी स्वतः समाप्त हो जाता है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की उक्त परियोजना 2 वर्ष से कम अवधि की रही है तब अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ० 3-बी(2) से शासित होता है और प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ० का लाभ प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहता है। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की उक्त परियोजना विशेष का कार्य अक्टू० 85 से जुलाई, 87 तक 2 वर्ष से कम अवधि तक चला है जिस परियोजना की समाप्ति पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक का कार्य स्वतः समाप्त हो गया है और उसे माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय के निर्देशानुसार अन्यत्र भी नहीं भेजा जा सकता। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को कभी सेवा से पृथक भी नहीं किया गया है वरन् प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा कार्य समाप्त होने पर स्वतः स्वेच्छा से सेवा का त्याग किया गया है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का मामला सेवा से छंटनी का भी नहीं रहा है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपना यह विवाद भी असाधारण विलम्ब से उठाया गया है तब वह कोई राहत भी प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक के मामले में अधिनियम के अधीन किसी भी प्रावधान की

अवहेलना नहीं की गयी है। अतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत क्लेम अस्वीकार किया जाकर निरस्त किया जावे।

4. प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा जवाब जवाब प्रस्तुत कर संक्षेप में यह अभिकथित किया गया है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षी विभाग के सब डिविजन, सवाई माधोपुर व कोटा में कार्य किया गया है जो इन डिविजन को बाद में नाम परिवर्तित करते हुए अन्यत्र स्थानान्तरित कर दिया गया है और इन डिविजन का समस्त कार्य प्रतिपक्षी को स्थानान्तरित कर दिया गया है इसी कारण प्रतिपक्षी को पक्षकार बनाया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी ही प्रार्थी श्रमिक के नियोजन के समस्त दायित्वों व अधिकारों का वहन करता है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग का कार्य उद्योग की परिभाषा में आता है तथा प्रार्थी भी एक कर्मकार है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग के रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना का कार्य वर्तमान में भी जारी है और उस पर कार्य पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ श्रमिक अभी भी उक्त मूल प्रतिपक्षी विभाग में सेवारत है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की कोई भी रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना 2 वर्ष की अवधि में भी पूर्ण नहीं हुई है तथा प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत प्रकरण अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ के प्रावधानों से शासित होता है न कि धारा 25-एफ० एफ० एफ० 3-बी (2) से। अतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक को अपने क्लेम स्टेटमेंट में वर्णित राहत प्रदान की जावे।

5. प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से मौखिक साक्ष्य में स्वयं प्रार्थी केहरसिंह का शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिस पर प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा प्रतिपरीक्षा की गयी है। प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य में प्रलेख प्रदर्श डब्ल्यू 1 लगा डब्ल्यू 8 तक प्रस्तुत कर प्रदर्शित करवाये गये हैं जिनका यथा समय उल्लेख किया जावेगा। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से मौखिक साक्ष्य में साक्षी शिवाजी उपाध्याय उप मण्डल अभियन्ता, टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकेशन) दिल्ली का शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिस पर प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रतिपरीक्षा की गयी है। प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य में कम्पिटिशन रिपोर्ट वकर्स विवरण-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया गया है।

6. मैंने दोनों पक्षों के विद्वान प्रतिनिधिगण की बहस सुनी जो बहस उनके उक्त अभिवचनों के अनुरूप ही रही है। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा अपनी बहस समर्थन में माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "ए०आई० आर० 1995 एस० सी० 1163-हिन्दुस्तान स्टील वर्क्स कंस्ट्रक्शन लिमि० बनाम हिन्दुस्तान स्टील वर्क्स कंस्ट्रक्शन लि० एम्प्लोईज यूनियन, हैदराबाद एवं अन्य, माननीय राज० उच्च न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "1993 लेब-आई० सी० 678-दिनेश कुमार बनाम यूनियन आफ इण्डिया एवं अन्य एवं माननीय पंजाब एवं हरियाणा उच्च न्यायालय की पूर्ण पी० का न्यायदृष्टांत 1979 लेब० आई० सी० 12-सुन्दरसिंह बनाम बेस कंस्ट्रक्शन बोर्ड, न्यू दिल्ली एवं अन्य" को उद्धृत किया गया है। इसके प्रतिवाद में विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "ए०आई० आर० 1999 एस० सी० 355-लाल मोहम्मद एवं अन्य बनाम इण्डियन

रेलवे कंस्ट्रक्शन कंपनी लिमि० एवं अन्य" को उद्धृत किया गया है।

7. मैंने दोनों पक्षकारों के विद्वान प्रतिनिधिगण की बहस पर विचार किया तथा उद्धृत उक्त न्यायदृष्टांत में प्रतिपादित न्याय सिद्धांतों व अभिमतों पर तथा पत्रावली अभिलेख पर ध्यानपूर्वक अवलोकन व मनन किया।

8. क्लेम समर्थन में मौखिक साक्ष्य में प्रस्तुत शपथ-पत्र पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अपने नियोजनकाल व कार्यदिवसों के सन्दर्भ में यह मुख्यतः साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां नियोजित होकर नियोजक के अधीन सहा० अभियन्ता, सवाईमाधोपुर के यहां माह अक्टू० 85 से जनवरी, 87 व तदुपरान्त कोटा स्थानान्तरित होकर सहा० अभियन्ता, कोटा के यहां फर० 87 से 31-5-87 तक निरन्तर कार्य किया गया है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि० 1-6-87 से सेवा से पृथक कर दिया गया। प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपनी साक्ष्य समर्थन में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रार्थी श्रमिक के नियोजन काल व कार्य दिवसों के प्रमाणित कार्य विवरण-पत्र प्रलेख प्रदर्श डबल्यू-5 लगा डबल्यू-8 भी प्रस्तुत कर प्रदर्शित करवाये गये हैं जिनमें से प्रदेश डबल्यू-8 जोकि सवाईमाधोपुर कार्यस्थल का प्रलेख रहा है, के अवलोकन पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अक्टू० 85 से अगस्त, 86 की नियोजनावधि में ही कुल 277 दिवस कार्य किया जाना प्रकट होता है। इसके अतिरिक्त प्रदर्श डबल्यू-6 सवाईमाधोपुर कार्यस्थल की आगे की अवधि व प्रदर्श डबल्यू-5 कोटा कार्यस्थल की अवधि अर्थात् 31-5-87 तक के प्रलेख रहे हैं। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब क्लेम प्रस्तुत कर प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा साक्ष्य में अपना शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त कथित नियोजनकाल व कार्यदिवसों का प्रतिवाद भी नहीं किया गया है और न ही खण्डन में कोई प्रलेखी साक्ष्य ही प्रस्तुत की गयी है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की उक्त मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य से यह पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां नियोजनकाल माह अक्टू० 85 से माह, अप्रैल, 87 तक का रहा है और प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा उक्त नियोजनकाल में प्रत्येक 12 कलेण्डर माह में 240 दिवस सेवा कार्य पूर्ण कर कम से कम निरन्तर एक वर्ष की सेवा पूर्ण की गयी है।

9. प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अपनी सेवा मुक्ति के सन्दर्भ में आगे शपथ-पत्र पर मुख्यतः यह साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि० 1-6-87 से प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ रहे श्रमिकगण धासीराम व मोहन लाल को यथावत् सेवा पर नियोजित रखते हुए बिना एक माह का नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छंटनी का मुआवजा दिये अथवा प्रस्तावित किये अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ, जी० के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुए अनुचित व अवैध प्रकार से सेवा से पृथक कर दिया गया। आगे प्रतिपरीक्षा पर यह साक्ष्य भी रही है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ रहे उक्त श्रमिकों के अलावा मुन्शी, प्रहलाद अभी

भी प्रतिपक्षी विभाग में कार्यरत रहे हैं। इसके विपरीत प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की शपथ-पत्र पर इस सन्दर्भ में वैधानिक आपत्ति के अतिरिक्त यह साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को कभी भी सेवा से पृथक नहीं किया गया है वरन् प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा स्वतः स्वेच्छा से कार्य समाप्ति पर सेवा त्याग किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक साक्षी द्वारा शपथ-पत्र पर यह स्वीकार किया गया है कि उसके द्वारा शपथ-पत्र, अभिलेख व उपलब्ध जानकारी के आधार पर दिया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा अपनी उक्त साक्ष्य के समर्थन में प्रार्थी श्रमिक का स्वतः स्वेच्छा से सेवा त्याग के सन्दर्भ में कोई सेवा त्याग-पत्र, उपस्थिति रजिस्टर, इन्द्राजात, कार्यालय टिप्पणी आदि कोई प्रलेख प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है तब प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की उक्त साक्ष्य के अभाव में स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं रहती है जब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की शपथ-पत्र पर रही उक्त अखण्डित मौखिक साक्ष्य से यह भी पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि० 1-6-87 से सेवा से पृथक किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की शपथ-पत्र पर ऐसी साक्ष्य भी नहीं रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को सेवा से पृथक करते समय अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ० की परिपालना की गयी है तथा सेवा पृथक करने से पूर्व औ० वि० नियमों के नियम 77 के अनुसार प्रार्थी श्रमिक संवर्ग की कोई वरिष्ठता सूची का प्रकाशन किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा शपथ-पत्र की साक्ष्य पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा उक्त कथित कनिष्ठ श्रमिकगण के यथावत् नियोजित रहने का भी स्पष्टतः प्रतिवाद नहीं किया गया है। इस सन्दर्भ में शपथ-पत्र की प्रतिपरीक्षा पर यह कथन भी किया गया है कि साक्षी को यह पता नहीं है कि उक्त कथित कनिष्ठ श्रमिक प्रतिपक्षी विभाग में वर्तमान में कार्यरत है अथवा नहीं तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अखण्डित रही साक्ष्य से यह भी पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को सेवा से पृथक करते समय अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०, जी० व ओ० वि० नियमों के नियम 77 के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की परिपालना नहीं की गयी है।

10. प्रमाणित उक्त तथ्यों पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रथम यह वैधानिक आपत्ति रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकॉम विभाग, अधिनियम के अधीन परिभाषित एक "उद्योग" नहीं रहा है तब प्रतिपक्षी विभाग पर अधिनियम के प्रावधान प्रभावी नहीं होते हैं। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय द्वारा अपने न्यायदृष्टान्त "ए० आई० आर० 1998 एस०सी० 656—जनरल मैनेजर, टेलीकॉम बनाम एस० श्रीनिवास राव व अन्य" के मामले में उक्त बिन्दु पर पूर्व में रहे विवाद को समाप्त करते हुए यह स्पष्टतः प्रतिपादित कर दिया गया है कि टेलीकॉम विभाग अधिनियम की धारा 2(जे) में परिभाषित एक "उद्योग" रहा है, वह व्यावसायिक कार्यों का निष्पादन करता है और उसके द्वारा सरकार के किसी सम्प्रभुता के

कार्य का निष्पादन नहीं किया जाता है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

11. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से द्वितीय यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन प्रार्थी श्रमिक का नियोजक नहीं रहा है बल्कि नियोजक सब-डिवीजन, सवाईमाधोपुर व कोटा रहे है जिन्हे प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा पक्षकार नहीं बनाया गया है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत क्लेम मात्र इस आधार पर ही निरस्तनीय रहा है। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से उक्त सन्दर्भ में जमानूजबाबू प्रस्तुत कर यह कथन रहे हैं कि कोटा व सवाईमाधोपुर स्थित डिवीजन को परिवर्तित कर प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन बना दिया गया है और प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन ही पूर्व में रहे सवाईमाधोपुर व कोटा डिवीजन के समस्त अधिकार व उत्तरदायित्व का निर्वहन कर रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त कथनों के खण्डन में सवाईमाधोपुर व कोटा डिवीजन के समापन व प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन के निर्माण सम्बन्धी कोई प्रलेख प्रस्तुत नहीं किये गये हैं तब प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

12. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से तृतीय यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक के नियोजक रहे सवाईमाधोपुर व कोटा डिवीजन का अन्दर अवधि दो वर्ष कार्य समाप्ति पर क्लोजर हो गया है जो उक्त डिवीजन का क्लोजर अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ०(1) के अन्वय (बी) के अन्तर्गत व धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ०(2) के अन्तर्गत रहा है तब प्रतिपक्षी विभाग के लिए उक्त डिवीजन के क्लोजर के लिए समुचित सरकारी से पूर्व स्वीकृति लिया जाना व सेवा से छटनी से पूर्व अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०(बी) की परिपालना किया जाना वैधानिक रूप में आवश्यक नहीं रहा है। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा उक्त सन्दर्भ में माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टान्त "ए०आई०आर० 1995 एस०सी० 1163, माननीय राज० उच्च न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टान्त 1993 लेब०आई०सी० 678 व माननीय पंजाब एवं हरियाणा उच्च न्यायालय की पूर्ण पीठ का न्यायदृष्टान्त 1979 लेब०आई०सी० 12" उद्धृत किये गये हैं। प्रतिवाद में प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी की ओर से माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्याय-दृष्टान्त "ए०आई०आर० 1999 एस०सी० 355" भी उद्धृत किया गया है। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ०(1) के प्रावधानानुसार यदि नियोजक अपनी किसी अण्डरटेकिंग का क्लोजर चाहता है तब उसे निर्धारित प्रफोर्म पर कम से कम 60 दिवस पूर्व समुचित सरकार को नोटिस दिया जाना आवश्यक रहता है। उक्त धारा के परन्तुक (बी) में यह अन्वय भी रहा है कि उक्त कथित नोटिस ऐसी अण्डरटेकिंग जो भवनों, पुलों,

सड़कों, नहरों, बांधों और ऐसी परियोजनाओं के अन्य निर्माण कार्यों का कार्य करती है, के क्लोजर होने पर दिया जाना आवश्यक नहीं रहेगा। अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ०(1) में यह प्रावधित रहा है कि जब कोई अण्डरटेकिंग किसी भी कारण से क्लोज-डाऊन की जायेगी तब उस अण्डरटेकिंग में कार्यरत रहे ऐसे श्रमिक जिनके द्वारा कम से कम एक वर्ष की निरन्तर पूर्ण सेवा कर ली गयी है, वे अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ० के अनुसार नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छटनी का मुआवजा प्राप्त करने के अधिकारी रहेंगे। उक्त धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ०(2) में यह प्रावधित रहा है कि ऐसी अण्डरटेकिंग जो भवनों, पुलों, सड़कों, नहरों व बांधों व ऐसे अन्य निर्माण कार्य करती है और उनका उक्त कार्य अन्दर अवधि 2 वर्ष समाप्त हो जाने पर उनका क्लोजर होना है तब भी अण्डरटेकिंग में कार्यरत श्रमिक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०(बी) के अन्तर्गत मुआवजा प्राप्त करने के अधिकारी नहीं रहते हैं। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब क्लेम प्रस्तुत कर यह तो अभिकथित किया गया है कि प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकॉम (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण) परियोजना का कार्य रेलवे लाइनों के विद्युतीकरण के कारण रेलवे लाइनों के साथ-साथ काम कर रही टेलीकॉम लाइनों को इण्डेक्शन जोन से सेफर जोन में स्थानान्तरित करने का रहा है। यह टेलीकॉम लाइनों का स्थानान्तरण किस प्रकार से निर्माण कार्य रहा है, इस सन्दर्भ में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से कोई मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है तब साक्ष्य विशेष के अभाव में टेलीकॉम लाइनों को इण्डेक्शन जोन से सेफर जोन में स्थानान्तरित किया जाना किसी भी प्रकार से उपरोक्त प्रावधित निर्माण कार्य होना नहीं पाया जाता है। प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकॉम विभाग द्वारा किये जाने वाला उक्त कार्य समाप्त हो गया, इस सन्दर्भ में भी प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से कोई साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है। इसके विपरीत प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन स्वयं उक्त कार्य के लिए वर्तमान तक भी विद्यमान रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से इस सन्दर्भ में कोई मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है कि प्रतिपक्षी विभाग का सवाईमाधोपुर व कोटा डिवीजन कब प्रारम्भ होकर कब समाप्त हुआ और उक्त डिवीजन उक्त कार्य के लिए एक स्वतन्त्र परियोजना इकाई रही है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में कथित उक्त परियोजना सम्बन्धी कोई प्रलेख न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है। उभयपक्षों द्वारा उद्धृत उक्त न्याय-दृष्टान्तों के मामले में नियोजक की ओर से कथित परियोजनाओं से सम्बन्धित समस्त प्रलेखों को प्रस्तुत किया गया है तब उक्त प्रलेखों के विवेचनोपरान्त उद्धृत उक्त निर्णयों में माननीय न्यायालयों द्वारा न्यायसिद्धान्त व अभिमत प्रकट किये गये हैं। इस न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उक्त सन्दर्भ में कोई प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है तब साक्ष्य के अभाव में उक्त न्यायदृष्टान्तों में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्त व अभिमत इस प्रकरण के लिए

सुसंगत नहीं रहे हैं। इस प्रकार उक्त तथ्यात्मक एवं वैधानिक विवेचनोपरान्त प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०ए०(1) के अपवाद (बी) व अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०ए०(2) का लाभ प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना नहीं पाया जाता है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

13. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से चतुर्थ यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा यह विवाद सेवा पृथक की तिथि 1-6-87 के लगभग 4 वर्ष पश्चात् दि० 15-4-91 के बाद असाधारण विलम्ब से उठाया गया है तब वह उक्त विवाद में कोई राहत प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहा है। मैंने इस वैधानिक आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। अधिनियम व उसके अधीन बनाये गये नियमों के अन्तर्गत विवाद प्रस्तुत किये जाने की कोई समयावधि निश्चित नहीं की हुई है तब भी माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय के न्यायद्वयान्त “ए०आई०आर० 1959 एस०सी० 1217-मै० शालीमार वर्क्स लिमि० बनाम उनके श्रमिकगण” में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्त अनुसार विवाद युक्तियुक्त समयावधि में ही प्रस्तुत किया जाना चाहिए। माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय द्वारा अपने न्यायद्वयान्त “(1977) 2 एस०सी० सी० 705-कोक्स एण्ड किम्स (एजेन्ट्स) लिमि० बनाम उनके श्रमिकगण” में उनके समक्ष रहे ऐसे मामले में जिसमें विवाद सन् 1966 में उत्पन्न हुआ था और 1966 में ही श्रम समझौता अधिकारी के समक्ष मामला प्रस्तुत कर दिया गया था किन्तु कुछ तकनीकी दोष रहने पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक को नोटिस दि० 25-10-72 को तामील करवाये जाने पर श्रमिक के विवाद को 6 वर्ष के असाधारण विलम्ब से प्रस्तुत किया जाना मानते हुए उसे उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का पिछला वेतन नहीं दिलवाये जाने का अभिमत प्रकट किया गया। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में अभिलेख पर यह प्रकट हुआ है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपना यह विवाद सेवा पृथक की तिथि 1-6-87 के लगभग 4 वर्ष पश्चात् दि० 15-4-91 के बाद असाधारण विलम्ब से उठाया गया है जिसकी पुष्टि स्वयं प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अभिलेख पर प्रस्तुत सहायक श्रमायुक्त (केन्द्रीय) के असफल वार्ता प्रतिवेदन दिनांकित 27-12-91 प्रदर्श डब्ल्यू० 4 से भी होता है जिसमें स्पष्टतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा सर्वप्रथम विवाद दि० 15-4-94 को उनके समक्ष उठाने का उल्लेख है, तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक भी उक्त न्यायद्वयान्तों में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्तों के प्रकाश में उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का कोई पिछला वेतन प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना नहीं रहता है जब मात्र इस आधार पर उसका यह क्लेम निरस्तनीय नहीं रहता है तथा प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति को भी उक्त प्रकार से निर्णीत किया जाता है। इस प्रकार साक्ष्य के उक्त विवेचनोपरान्त प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि० 1-6-87 से अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ० जी० व औ० वि० नियमों के नियम 77 के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते

हुए सेवा से पृथक किया जाना किसी भी प्रकार से उचित एवं वैध होना नहीं पाया जाता है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम के प्रावधानान्तर्गत प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहाँ नियोजन में सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पुनः सेवा पर बहाल करवाये जाने का अधिकारी होना भी पाया जाता है।

14. अब जहाँ तक प्रार्थी श्रमिक के पिछले वेतन को प्राप्त करने के अधिकार का प्रश्न है, प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से अपने क्लेम स्टेटमेंट में सेवा पृथक पश्चात् बेरोजगार रहने सम्बन्धी कोई अभिकथन नहीं रहे है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से भी प्रस्तुत जवाब में इस सम्बन्धी कोई प्रतिवाद नहीं रहा है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक की सर्वप्रथम अपने शपथपत्र पर यह साक्ष्य रही है कि वह सेवा पृथक अवधि में आज दिनांक तक बेरोजगार रहा है तब शपथपत्र की प्रतिपरीक्षा पर यह स्वीकारोक्ति भी रही है कि वो जो भी काम मिल जाता है कर लेता है इस प्रकार प्रार्थी श्रमिक की साक्ष्यानुसार ही प्रार्थी श्रमिक सेवा पृथक अवधि में आंशिक रूप से अन्यत्र लाभकारी नियोजित भी रहा है तब प्रस्तुत तथ्यों एवं समस्त परिस्थितियों को दृष्टिगत रखते हुए प्रार्थी श्रमिक पिछले वेतन स्वरूप 30% वेतन ही प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना पाया जाता है जो पिछला वेतन वो दि० 15-4-91 से प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी रहेगा।

15. अतः उक्त सम्पूर्ण विवेचन के आधार पर भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा सम्पादित निर्देश को इस प्रकार उत्तरित किया जाता है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक डिवीजनल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकेशन), बी-1/10, कम्प्यूनिटी सेन्टर, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक केहरसिंह को दिनांक 1-6-87 से सेवा से पृथक करना उचित एवं वैध नहीं है, फलस्वरूप प्रार्थी श्रमिक अपनी सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पुनः सेवा में आने का अधिकारी घोषित किया जाता है। चूँकि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा सेवा से पृथक की तिथि 1-6-87 के लगभग 4 वर्ष पश्चात् दि० 15-4-91 को विलम्ब से विवाद उठाया गया है, अतः प्रकरण की परिस्थितियों में प्रार्थी श्रमिक उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का कोई वेतन प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा व तदुपरान्त दि० 15-4-91 से पिछले वेतन स्वरूप 30% वेतन ही प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होगा।

इस अधिनियम को समुचित सरकार को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाया जावे।

जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2570—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डिवीजनल इंजीनियर टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकेशन) नई दिल्ली के प्रबंधन के सज्जद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक

विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[स. एल-40012/47/94-आई आर (डीयू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2570.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Divisional Engineer Telecom, Railway Electrification, New Delhi and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-40012/47/94-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

अनुबंध

न्यायाधीश, औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण केन्द्रीय, कोटा, राज.

निर्देश प्रकरण क्रमांक : औ. न्या. -20/95

दिनांक स्थापित : 9-8-95

प्रसंग : भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के आदेश क्रमांक एल.-40012/47/94-आई आर. (डी.यू.)

दिनांक 20/7/95, 4/8/95

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

मध्य

सुरेश कुमार पुत्र श्री महादेव यादव द्वारा श्री रामनिवास गोधर, खण्ड गांवड़ी, सिविल लाईन्स, नयापुरा, कोटा
—प्रार्थी श्रमिक

एव

डिविजनल इंजीनियर, दूर संचार (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण) परियोजना, बी-1/10, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली।

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थिति

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद, शर्मा,
आर. एच. जे. एस.

प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि : श्री के. एम. यादव
प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि : श्री सी.बी. सोरल
अर्धनिर्णय दिनांक : 2/6/99

अर्धनिर्णय

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा निम्न-निर्देश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (जिसे तदुपरांत "अधिनियम" से संबोधित किया जावेगा, की धारा 10(1)

(घ) के अन्तर्गत इस न्यायाधिकरण को अर्धनिर्णयार्थ सम्प्रेषित किया गया है :—

"क्या प्रबन्धतन्त्र डिविजन इंजीनियर, टेलीफोन, रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली द्वारा श्री सुरेश कुमार पुत्र श्री महादेव यादव की सेवायें समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही उचित एवं न्यायसंगत है, यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है और किस तारीख से ?"

2. निर्देश न्यायाधिकरण में प्राप्त होने पर दर्ज रजिस्टर किया गया व पक्षकारों को सूचना जारी की गयी। प्रार्थी श्रमिक सुरेश कुमार यादव की ओर से क्लेम स्टेटमेंट प्रस्तुत कर संक्षेप में यह अभिकथित किया गया है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षीगण 1. जिला अभियन्ता टेलीफोन बजरिया, सवाईमाधोपुर, 2. मुख्य महाप्रबन्धक, दूरसंचार, एम.आई. रोड, जयपुर एवं 3. डिविजनल इंजीनियर टेलीफोन (आर.ई.) बी-1/10 शोपिंग सेंटर, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली (जिन्हें तदुपरांत "प्रतिपक्षीगण नियोजक" से संबोधित किया जावेगा) के नियोजन में रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकेशन परियोजना, सवाईमाधोपुर डिविजन कोटा में दूरसंचार जिला अभियन्ता, सवाईमाधोपुर के यहां दि. 17/8/85 से दैनिक वेतन भोगी आकस्मिक श्रमिक के रूप में नियोजित होकर दिनांक 9/4/87 तक के 20 माह के नियोजनकाल में कुल 446 दिवस सेवा कार्य कर, उक्त नियोजनकाल के प्रत्येक बारह कलेंडर माह में 240 दिवस पूर्ण सेवा कार्य कर लिया गया था तब प्रतिपक्षीगण नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि. 10/4/87 से बिना नियमानुसार प्रार्थी श्रमिक संवर्ग की वरिष्ठता सूची का प्रकाशन किये, प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ रहे अन्य कई श्रमिकों को यथावत कार्य पर नियोजित रखते हुये, बिना एक माह अथवा तीन माह का नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छटनी का मुआवजा दिये अथवा प्रस्तावित किये, अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ, एन; जी व औ. वि. नियमों के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुये, अनुचित व अवैध प्रकार से सेवा से पृथक कर दिया गया जो प्रार्थी वर्तमान तक बेरोजगार ही रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को उक्त प्रकार से सेवा से पृथक करने के पश्चात् भी अधिनियम की धारा 25-एच के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुये, प्रार्थी श्रमिक को पुनः नियोजक का अवसर प्रदान न करते हुये, प्रार्थी श्रमिक से कनिष्ठ रहे अन्य श्रमिकगण सर्वश्री कालुलाल, रामलक्ष्मण, प्रेमपाल व जोधराज आदि की सेवा पर पुनः नियोजित कर लिया और उन्हें नियोजन में स्थानी भी कर दिया जो वर्तमान तक प्रतिपक्षीगण नियोजक के यहां कार्यरत है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम के अधीन प्रतिपक्षीगण के यहां नियोजन में सेवा की निरन्तरता के साथ, पिछले सम्पूर्ण वेतन व देय अन्य समस्त परिलाभों सहित पुनः सेवा पर बहाल करवाये जाने का अधिकारी रहा है, अतः

प्रार्थीश्रमिक की ओर से प्रस्तुत उक्त क्लेम मंजूर्य स्वीकार किया जावे।

3. प्रतिपक्षी डिजिटल इंजीनियर, टेलीकॉम (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण) परियोजना, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली की ओर से जवाब क्लेम स्टेटमेंट प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त क्लेम को अस्वीकार किया गया है तथा प्रतिवाद स्वरूप यह अभिकथित किया गया है कि टेलीकॉम (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना) का विभाग अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत परिभाषित "उद्योग" नहीं रहा है तब अधिनियम के प्रावधान प्रतिपक्षी विभाग पर प्रभावी नहीं रहे हैं। प्रतिपक्षी, प्रार्थी श्रमिक का "नियोजक" भी नहीं रहा है बल्कि तत्कालीन सहा. अभियन्ता ही नियोजक रहा है जिसे प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा पक्षकार नहीं बनाया गया है। आगे यह भी अभिकथित किया गया है कि रेलवे विद्युतीकरण परियोजना के अन्तर्गत रेलवे लाईनों के विद्युतीकरण के कारण कार्य कर रही टेलीकॉम लाईनों को डिस्कनेक्शन जोन से दूर करने का कार्य किया जाता है जो कार्य पूर्णतया अस्थायी एवं समयबद्ध रहा है और उक्त कार्य पूर्ण होने पर परियोजना का कार्य समाप्त हो जाता है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का कार्य भी स्वतः समाप्त हो जाता है। प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की उक्त परियोजना 2 वर्ष से कम अवधि की रही है तब अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ. एफ. 3-बी(2) से शासित होती है और प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ का लाभ प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहता है। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में प्रतिपक्षी विभाग की उक्त परियोजना दो वर्ष से कम अवधि तक चली है तथा प्रार्थी परियोजना विधेय पर ही कार्यरत रहा है जिसके समाप्त होने के साथ ही प्रार्थी श्रमिक का कार्य स्वतः समाप्त हो गया है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक को प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा कभी भी सेवा से पृथक् नहीं किया गया है बल्कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा कार्य समाप्ति पर स्वतः स्वेच्छा से सेवा त्याग किया गया है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का मामला सेवा से छंटनी का नहीं रहा है और न मुद्दावजा दिये जाने का नियम उस पर लागू होता है। यह भी अभिकथित किया गया है कि श्रमिक यदि विवाद उत्पन्न करना चाहता तो उसे तुरन्त काम न दिये जाने के बाद समझौता अधिकारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत होकर अपना स्पष्टीकरण प्रस्तुत करना चाहिये था, किन्तु श्रमिक एक लम्बे अरसे के पश्चात् विवाद प्रस्तुत करने के लिये उपस्थित हुआ है जिसका कि उसे कानूनी अधिकार नहीं है और ब वह कोई राहत भी इसी आधार पर प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक के मामले में अधिनियम के अधीन किसी भी प्रावधान की अवहेलना नहीं की गयी है। अतः प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत क्लेम अस्वीकार किया जाकर निरस्त किया जावे।

4. प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से मौखिक साक्ष्य में स्वयं प्रार्थी सुरेश कुमार यादव का शपथपत्र प्रस्तुत हुआ है जिस पर प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा प्रतिपरीक्षा

की गयी है। प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य में प्रदर्श 1 लगा। प्रस्तुत कर प्रदर्शित करवाये गये हैं जिनका यथामय उल्लेख किया जायेगा। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से मौखिक साक्ष्य में साक्षी शिवाजी उपाध्याय, उप मण्डल अभियन्ता टेलीकॉम (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिकीफिकेशन) दिल्ली का शपथ पत्र प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिस पर प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रतिपरीक्षा की गयी है। प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य में कम्प्लीशन रिपोर्ट आफ वर्क्स विवरण-पत्र प्रदर्श एम. 1 प्रस्तुत कर प्रदर्शित करवाया गया है।

5. मैंने दोनों पक्षों के विद्वान प्रतिनिधिगण की बहस सुनी जो बहस उनके उक्त अभिपत्तियों के अनुरूप ही रही है। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा अपनी बहस समर्थन में माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "ए. आई. आर. 1995 एस. सी. 1163—हिन्दुस्तान स्टील वर्क्स कंस्ट्रक्शन लिमि. बनाम हिन्दुस्तान स्टील वर्क्स कंस्ट्रक्शन लि. एम्पलाइज यूनियन, हैदराबाद एवं अन्य, माननीय राज. उच्च न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "1993 लेब आई. सी. 678—दिनेश कुमार बनाम यूनियन आफ इण्डिया एवं अन्य एवं माननीय पंजाब एवं हरियाणा उच्च न्यायालय की पूर्ण पीठ का न्यायदृष्टांत 1979 लेब. आई. सी. 12—सुन्दरसिंह बनाम वेस कंस्ट्रक्शन बोर्ड, न्यू दिल्ली एवं अन्य" को उद्धृत किया गया है। इसके प्रतिवाद में विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत "ए. आई. आर. 1999 एस. सी. 355—नाज मोहम्मद एवं अन्य बनाम इण्डियन रेलवे कंस्ट्रक्शन कंपनी लिमि. एवं अन्य" को उद्धृत किया गया है।

6. मैंने दोनों पक्षों के विद्वान प्रतिनिधिगण की बहस पर विचार किया तथा उद्धृत उक्त न्याय दृष्टांतों में प्रतिपादित न्यायनिष्ठांतों व अभिमतों पर तथा पत्रावली व अभिलेख पर ध्यानपूर्वक अवलोकन किया व मनन किया।

7. क्लेम समर्थन में मौखिक साक्ष्य में प्रस्तुत शपथ-पत्र पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक का अपने नियोजनकाल व कार्य-दिवसों के संदर्भ में यह मुख्यतः साक्ष्य रही कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां दि. 17-8-85 से नियोजित होकर दि. 9-4-87 तक के 20 माह के नियोजन काल में निरन्तर कार्य किया गया है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपने साक्ष्य के समर्थन में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रार्थी श्रमिक के नियोजनकाल व कार्य दिवसों का प्रमाणित कार्य विवरण-पत्र प्रलेख प्रदर्श 1 भी प्रस्तुत कर प्रदर्शित करवाया गया है। प्रलेख प्रदर्श 1 के अवलोकन पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा यह प्रमाणित किया गया है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा माह अगस्त, 85 से अप्रैल, 87 तक की नियोजनाविधि में कुल 446 दिास कार्य किया गया है जिन कार्य दिवसों का मस्ट्रोत्स सख्या सहित माहवार विवरण भी अंकित किया हुआ है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब

क्लेम प्रस्तुत कर व प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा साक्ष्य में अपना शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त कथित नियोजनकाल व कार्यदिवसों का प्रतिवाद भी नहीं किया गया है और न ही खण्डन में कोई प्रलेखनीय साक्ष्य ही प्रस्तुत की गयी है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की उक्त मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य से यह पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां नियोजनकाल माह अगस्त, 85 से अप्रैल, 87 तक 20 माह का रहा है और प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा उक्त नियोजनकाल में प्रत्येक 12 कलेण्डर माह में 240 दिवस सेवा कार्य पूर्ण कर कम से कम निरन्तर एक वर्ष की सेवा पूर्ण की गयी है।

8. प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अपनी सेवा मुक्ति के सन्दर्भ में आगे शपथ-पत्र पर मुख्यतः यह साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दि. 10-4-87 से बिना वरिष्ठता सूची का प्रकाशन किये व बिना एक माह का नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छंटनी का मुआवजा दिये अथवा प्रस्तावित किये अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ एवं ओ. वि. नियमों के नियम 77 के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुए अनुसूचित अर्बद्ध प्रकार से सेवा से पृथक कर दिया गया। इसके विपरीत प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की शपथ-पत्र पर इस सन्दर्भ में वैधानिक आपत्तियों के अतिरिक्त यह साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक की कभी भी सेवा से पृथक नहीं किया गया व वर्न् परियोजना से विशेष कार्य समाप्त होने पर प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा स्वतः स्वेच्छा से सेवा त्याग किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक साक्ष्य द्वारा शपथ-पत्र पर यह स्वीकार किया गया है कि उसके द्वारा शपथ-पत्र उपलब्ध जानकारी के आधार पर दिया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा अपनी उक्त साक्ष्य के समर्थन में प्रार्थी श्रमिक का स्वतः स्वेच्छा से सेवा त्याग के सन्दर्भ में कोई सेवा त्याग-पत्र, उपस्थिति रजिस्टर इ. द्राजात, कार्यालय टिप्पणी आदि कोई प्रलेख प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है तब प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की उक्त साक्ष्य व्यक्तगत जानकारी न होने के आधार पर व अभिलेख व सन्निहित साक्ष्य के अभाव में स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं रहती है जब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की शपथ-पत्र पर रही उक्त अखण्डित मौखिक साक्ष्य से यह पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को 10-4-87 से सेवा से पृथक किया गया है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की शपथ-पत्र पर ऐसी साक्ष्य भी नहीं रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को सेवा से पृथक करते समय अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ की परिपालना की गयी है तथा सेवा पृथक करने से पूर्व ओ. वि. नियमों के नियम 77 के अनुसार प्रार्थी संवर्ग की कोई वरिष्ठता सूची का प्रकाशन किया गया है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक की अखण्डित रही साक्ष्य से यह भी पूर्णतया प्रमाणित हुआ है कि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को सेवा से पृथक करते समय अधिनियम की

धारा 25-एफ व ओ. वि. नियमों के नियम 77 के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की परिपालना नहीं की गयी है।

9. प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपने क्लेम व शपथ-पत्र में यह भी अभिकथन व साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत की गयी है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा उसे सेवा से पृथक किये जाने के बाद अन्य नव श्रमिकगण सर्वश्री कालूलाल, रामलक्ष्मन, प्रेमलाल व जीवराज आदि को नियोजित किया गया है जो वर्तमान में भी ड्यूटी पर हैं तथा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को पुनः नियोजन का अवसर प्रदान नहीं किया गया है और इस प्रकार प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा अधिनियम की धारा 25-एच के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना की गयी है। इस संदर्भ में यही लिखना पर्याप्त है कि चूंकि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजन द्वारा उक्त प्रकार से अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ के आज्ञात्मक प्रावधानों की स्पष्ट रूप से अवहेलना किया जाना प्रमाणित पाया गया है इसलिए अब अधिनियम की धारा 25-एच के सन्दर्भ में कानूनी रूप से विचार किया जाना आवश्यक नहीं रहा है। बेसे भी अधिनियम की धारा 25-एच के प्रावधान उन्हीं श्रमिकों पर प्रभावी होना माना जा सकता है जिन श्रमिकों की वैध प्रकार से छंटनी की गयी हो।

10. प्रमाणित उक्त तथ्यों पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रथम यह वैधानिक आपत्ति रही है कि प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकाम विभाग, अधिनियम के अधीन परिभाषित एक "उद्योग" नहीं रहा है तब प्रतिपक्षी विभाग पर अधिनियम के प्रावधान प्रभावी नहीं होते हैं। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय द्वारा अपने न्याय-दृष्टांत "ए.आई.आर. 1998 एस.सी. 656-जनरल मैनेजर टेलीकाम बनाम एस. श्रीनिवासराव एवं अन्य" के मामले में उक्त बिन्दु पर पूर्व में रहे विवाद को समाप्त करते हुए यह स्पष्टः प्रतिपादित कर दिया गया है कि टेलीकाम विभाग अधिनियम की धारा 2(जे) से परिभाषित एक "उद्योग" रहा है, वह व्यावसायिक कार्यों का निष्पादन करता है और उसके द्वारा सरकार के किसी सम्प्रभुता के कार्य का निष्पादन नहीं किया जाता है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

11. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से द्वितीय यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रतिपक्षी डिवीजन प्रार्थी श्रमिक का नियोजक नहीं रहा बल्कि नियोजक तत्कालीन सहा. अभियन्ता रहा है जिसे प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा पक्षकार नहीं बनाया गया है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक का प्रस्तुत क्लेम मात्र इसी आधार पर ही निरस्तनीय रहा है। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त संदर्भ में क्लेम स्टेटमेंट व शपथ-पत्र में यह अभिकथन, व साक्ष्य रही है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक डिवीजन इंजीनियर

सवाईमाधोपुर, के अधीन कार्यरत था जिसका कार्यभार अभी डिविजन इंजीनियर, दूर-संचार (रेलवे इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन) नई दिल्ली के पास है, इस कारण प्रतिपक्षी डिविजन नई दिल्ली को ही पक्षकार बनाया गया है। प्रार्थी श्रमिक की शपथ पत्र पर रही उक्त साक्ष्य पर प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से कोई प्रतिपरीक्षा भी नहीं की गयी है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रार्थी श्रमिक के उक्त कथनों के खंडन में सवाईमाधोपुर डिविजन के समापन व प्रतिपक्षी डिविजन के निर्माण संबंधी कोई प्रलेख भी प्रस्तुत नहीं किये गये हैं तब प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती।

12. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से तृतीय यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक के नियोजक रहे सवाईमाधोपुर डिविजन का अन्तर अवधि दो वर्ष कार्य समाप्त होने पर बलोजर हो गया है जो उक्त डिविजन का बलोजर अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०ए० (1) के अपवाद (बी) के अन्तर्गत व धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ० (2) के अन्तर्गत रहा है तब प्रतिपक्षी विभाग के लिए उक्त डिविजन के बलोजर के लिए समुचित सरकार से पूर्व स्वीकृति लिया जाना व सेवा से छंटनी से पूर्व अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ (बी) की परिपालना किया जाना वैधानिक रूप में आवश्यक नहीं रहा है। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा उक्त संदर्भ में माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत 'ए.आई.आर. 1995 एस.सी. 1163, माननीय राज. उच्च न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत 1993 लैब. आई.सी. 678 व माननीय पंजाब एवं हरियाणा उच्च न्यायालय की पणपीठ का न्यायदृष्टांत 1979 लैब. आई.सी. 12" उद्धरित भी किये गये हैं। प्रतिवाद में प्रतिनिधि प्रार्थी की ओर से माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय का न्यायदृष्टांत 'ए.आई.आर. 1999 एस.सी. 355' भी उद्धरित किया गया। मैंने प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ० (1) के प्रावधानानुसार यदि नियोजक अपनी किसी अण्डरटेकिंग का बलोजर चाहता है तब उसे निर्धारित प्रफॉर्म पर कम से कम 60 दिवस पूर्व समुचित सरकार को नोटिस दिया जाना आवश्यक रहता है। उक्त धारा के परन्तुक (बी) में यह अपवाद भी रहा है कि उक्त कथित नोटिस ऐसा अण्डरटेकिंग जो भवनों, पुलों, सड़कों, नहरों, बांधों और ऐसी परियोजनाओं के अन्य निर्माण कार्यों का कार्य करती है, के बलोजर होने पर दिया जाना आवश्यक नहीं रहेगा अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ० (1) में यह प्रावधित रहा है कि जब कोई अण्डरटेकिंग में कार्यरत रहे ऐसे श्रमिक जिनके द्वारा कम से कम एक वर्ष की निरन्तर पूर्ण सेवा करली गयी है, वे अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ० के अनुसार नोटिस अथवा नोटिस वेतन व छंटनी का मुआवजा प्राप्त करने के अधिकारी रहेंगे। उक्त धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ० (2) में यह प्रावधित रहा है कि ऐसी अण्डरटेकिंग जो भवनों, पुलों, सड़कों, नहरों व बांधों व ऐसे अन्य

निर्माण कार्य करती है और उनका उक्त कार्य अन्तर अवधि 2 वर्ष समाप्त हो जाने पर उनका बलोजर होना है तब ही अण्डरटेकिंग में कार्यरत श्रमिक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ (बी) के अन्तर्गत मुआवजा प्राप्त करने के अधिकारी नहीं रहती है। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से जवाब ब्लेस प्रस्तुत कर यह तो अभिकथित किया गया है कि प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकाम (रेलवे विद्युतीकरण) परियोजना का कार्य रेलवे लाईनों के विद्युतीकरण के कारण रेलवे लाईनों के साथ-साथ काम कर रही टेलीकाम लाईनों को इंडेक्शन जोन से सेफर जोन में स्थानान्तरित करने का रहा है। यह टेलीकाम लाईनों का स्थानान्तरण किस प्रकार से निर्माण कार्य कर रहा है, इस संदर्भ में प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से कोई मौखिक एवं प्रलेखीय माध्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है। तब माध्य विशेष के अभाव में टेलीफोन लाईनों को इंडेक्शन जोन से सेफर जोन में स्थानान्तरित किया जाना किसी भी प्रकार से उपरोक्त प्राबधित निर्माण कार्य होता नहीं पाया जाता है। प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकाम विभाग द्वारा किये जाने वाला उक्त कार्य समाप्त हो गया, इस संदर्भ में भी प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से कोई साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है। इसके विपरीत प्रतिपक्षी डिविजन स्वयं उक्त कार्य के लिए वर्तमान तक भी विद्यमान रहा है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की शपथ पत्र पर प्रतिपरीक्षा पर इस संदर्भ में महत्वपूर्ण स्वीकारोक्तियां भी रही है कि रेलवे लाईनों के विद्युतीकरण के फलस्वरूप प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकाम विभाग को अपनी टेलीकाम लाईनें जो रेलवे लाईनों के साथ-साथ रही है, को इंडेक्शन जोन से सेफर जोन में स्थानान्तरित किया जाना आवश्यक हो गया था तब प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकाम विभाग द्वारा इस कार्य को अपनी एक परियोजना के रूप में लिया जोकि पूरे भारत को तीन जोनों में विभक्त किया गया है। जिनके अलग-अलग डायरेक्टर नियुक्त रहे हैं और उन तीनों के ऊपर मुख्य महाप्रबंधक (आर.ई.) नियुक्त रहा है। उक्त प्रत्येक जोन के अधीन कार्य की आवश्यकतानुसार डिविजन तथा सब-डिविजन रहे है। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की आगे यह स्वीकारोक्ति भी रही है कि डी. ई. टी. सवाईमाधोपुर, नई दिल्ली के अण्डर में आता था तब प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की शपथ पत्र पर रही उक्त स्वीकारोक्तियों अनुसार भी प्रतिपक्षी टेलीकाम विभाग की उक्त परियोजना का समापन हो जाना नहीं पाया जाता है। आगे प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की सवाईमाधोपुर डिविजन के प्रारम्भ होने व उसके समापन होने के संदर्भ में शपथ पत्र पर मुख्यतः यही साक्ष्य रही है कि सवाईमाधोपुर डिविजन का कार्य 1-11-85 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30-6-86 तक चला था और उसके पश्चात् समाप्त हो गया। प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा अपनी उक्त साक्ष्य समर्थन में कम्पलीशन रिपोर्ट प्रलेख प्रदर्श एम. 1 भी प्रस्तुत की गयी है। प्रस्तुत उक्त प्रलेख के अवलोकन पर यह भी प्रकट हुआ है कि उक्त कम्पलीशन रिपोर्ट प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा ही बनायी गयी है जिसे स्वयं प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी ने अपनी प्रतिपरीक्षा में अपनी हस्ताक्षरित होना

स्वीकार किया है तब उक्त रिपोर्ट एक स्टेटमेंट के रूप में रही है जो स्वयं में कोई साक्ष्य नहीं रही है तथा प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी द्वारा जिन प्रलेखों के आधार पर उक्त स्टेटमेंट बनाया गया है, उन प्रलेखों को उक्त स्टेटमेंट/रिपोर्ट के समर्थन में न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रस्तुत भी नहीं किया गया है तब प्रतिपक्षी साक्षी की उक्त मौखिक साक्ष्य का किसी प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य से समर्थन नहीं हुआ है। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से सवाईमाधोपुर डिविजन के प्रारम्भ किये जाने व समापन किये जाने संबंधी कोई प्रलेख भी न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रस्तुत नहीं किये गये हैं तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की साक्ष्य से यह कतई प्रमाणित नहीं हुआ है कि प्रतिपक्षी विभाग का सवाईमाधोपुर जन डिविजन प्रारंभ होकर कब समाप्त हुआ और सवाईमाधोपुर डिविजन उक्त कार्य के लिए एक स्वतंत्र परियोजना ईकाई रही हो। प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में कथित परियोजना संबंधी कोई प्रलेख न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है। उभय पक्षों द्वारा उद्धृत उक्त न्याय-दृष्टांतों के मामले में नियोजन की ओर से कथित परियोजनाओं से सम्बन्धित समस्त प्रलेखों को प्रस्तुत किया गया है तब उक्त प्रलेखों के विवेचनोपरान्त उद्धृत उक्त निर्णयों में माननीय न्यायालयों द्वारा न्यायसिद्धान्त व अभिमत प्रकट किए गए हैं। इस न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उक्त संदर्भ में कोई प्रलेखीय साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी है तब साक्ष्य के आकड़े से उक्त न्याय-दृष्टांतों में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्त व अभिमत इस प्रकरण के लिए सुसंगत नहीं रहे हैं। इस प्रकार उक्त तथ्यात्मक एवं वैधानिक विवेचनोपरान्त प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०ए०(1) के अपवाद (बी) व अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ०एफ०एफ०(2) का लाभ प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना नहीं पाया जाता है तब प्रतिपक्षी नियोजन की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति भी स्वीकार किए जाने योग्य नहीं पायी जाती है।

13. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से चतुर्थ यह वैधानिक आपत्ति उठायी गयी है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा यह विवाद सेवा पृथक की तिथि 10-4-87 के लम्बे अरसे के बाद विलम्ब से उठाया गया है तब वह उक्त विवाद में कोई राहत प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं रहा है। मैंने इस वैधानिक आपत्ति पर भी विचार किया। अधिनियम व उसके अधीन बनाये गये नियमों के अन्तर्गत विवाद प्रस्तुत किये जाने की कोई समयावधि निश्चित नहीं की हुई है तब भी माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय के न्यायदृष्टांत "ए. आर्. आर. 1959 एस. सी. 1917—मै. शालीमार वर्क्स लिमि. बनाम उनके श्रमिकरण" में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्त अनुसार विवाद युक्तियुक्त समयावधि में ही प्रस्तुत किया जाना चाहिए। माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय द्वारा अपने न्यायदृष्टांत "(1977) 2 एस.सी.सी. 705—कोक्स एण्ड किम्स (एजेन्ट्स) लिमि. बनाम उनके श्रमिकरण" में उनके समक्ष रहे ऐसे मामले में जिससे विवाद सन 1966 में उत्पन्न हुआ था और 1966 में ही श्रम समझौता अधि-

कारी के समक्ष मामला प्रस्तुत कर दिया गया था किन्तु कुछ तकनीकी दोष रहने पर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक को नोटिस दि. 25-10-72 को तामील करवाये जाने पर श्रमिक के विवाद को 6 वर्ष के असाधारण विलम्ब से प्रस्तुत किया जाना मानते हुए उसे उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का पिछला वेतन नहीं दिलवाये जाने का अभिमत प्रगट किया गया। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में अभिलेख पर यह प्रकट हुआ है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा अपना यह विवाद सेवा पृथक की तिथि 10-4-87 के लगभग 6 वर्ष पश्चात् दि. 26-3-93 को असाधारण विलम्ब से उठाया गया है जिसका कि समर्थन अभिलेख पर प्रस्तुत सहा. श्रमायुक्त (केन्द्रीय) के असफल वार्ता प्रतिवेदन दिनांकित 24-3-94 प्रदर्श 5 से भी होता है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक भी उक्त न्यायदृष्टांतों में प्रतिपादित न्यायसिद्धान्तों के प्रकाश में उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का कोई पिछला वेतन प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना नहीं रहता है तथा प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से उठायी गयी उक्त आपत्ति को भी उक्त प्रकार से निर्णित किया जाता है। इस प्रकार साक्ष्य के उक्त विवेचनोपरान्त प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दिनांक 10-4-87 से अधिनियम की धारा 25-एफ व औ. वि. नियमों के नियम 77 के आजातक प्रावधानों की अवहेलना करते हुए सेवा से पृथक किया जाना किसी भी प्रकार उचित एवं बंध होना नहीं पाया जाता है तब प्रार्थी श्रमिक अधिनियम के प्रावधानान्तर्गत प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां नियोजन में सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पुनः सेवा पर बहाल करवाये जाने का अधिकारी होना भी पाया जाता है।

14. अब जहां तक प्रार्थी श्रमिक के पिछले वेतन को प्राप्त करने के अधिकार का प्रश्न है, प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से क्लेम स्टेटमेंट व शपथ-पत्र पर य. अभिकथन व साक्ष्य रही है कि वह सेवा पृथक दिनांक से आज दिन तक बेरोजगार रहा है, उसे कोई नौकरी आज तक नहीं मिली है, परन्तु शपथ-पत्र की प्रतिपरीक्षा पर उसकी यह स्पष्ट स्वीकारोक्ति रही है कि वह मजदूरी करने जाता है, उसे 30-35 रु. रोज मिल जाते हैं व उसकी पत्नी भी 30-40 रु. रोज कमा लेती है। इस प्रकार श्रमिक की साक्ष्यानुसार ही प्रार्थी श्रमिक सेवा पृथक अवधि में आंशिक रूप से अन्यत्र लाभकारी नियोजित भी रहा है तब प्रस्तुत तथ्यों एवं समस्त परिस्थितियों को दृष्टिगत रखते हुए प्रार्थी श्रमिक पिछले वेतन स्वरूप 30% वेतन ही प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होना पाया जाता है जो पिछला वेतन वो दि. 26-3-93 से प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी रहेगा।

15. अतः उक्त उस सम्पूर्ण विवेचन के आधार पर भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा संप्रेषित निर्देश को इस प्रकार उत्तरित किया जाता है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक डिविजन इंजिनियर, टेलीकाम, रेलवे, विद्युतीकरण परियोजना जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक सुरेश कुमार यादव को दिनांक 10-4-87 से सेवा से पृथक करना उचित एवं बंध नहीं है, फलस्वरूप प्रार्थी श्रमिक अपनी सेवा

की निरन्तरता सहित पुनः सेवा में आने का अधिकारी घोषित किया जाता है। चूंकि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा सेवा से पृथक् की तिथि 10-4-87 के लगभग 6 वर्ष पश्चात् दि. 26-3-93 को विलम्ब से उठाया गया है, अतः प्रकरण की परिस्थितियों में प्रार्थी श्रमिक उक्त विलम्ब अवधि का कोई वेतन प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा व तदुपरान्त दि. 26-3-93 से पिछले वेतन स्वरूप 30% वेतन ही प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी होगा।

इस अधिनिर्णय को समुचित सरकार को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाया जावे।

जगदीश प्रसाद शर्मा, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2571.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जनरल मैनेजर, व्हीकल फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में य सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण; जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, क दी य सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14012/45/93-आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2571.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of General Manager, Vehicle Factory, Jabalpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-14012/45/93-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (4)/95

Shri Bhagwan Das Prajapati,
S/o Late Punnoo,
Village Panagar,
Subhash Ward,
Badi Khermai, Panagar,
District Jabalpur. ... Workman.

V/s.

General Manager,
Vehicle Factory,
Jabalpur. ... Management.

AWARD

Delivered on this 12th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-14012/45/93-IR(DU), dated 28th

December, 1994 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Court :

अनुसूची

'क्या प्रबंधन व्हीकल फैक्ट्री जबलपुर (म. प्र.) के प्रबंधकों द्वारा श्री भगवानदास प्रजापति एक्स लेवर टि. न. वाय एंड ई/172/11928 की सेवाये आदेश दिनांक 11-8-93 से समाप्त किय जाने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनतोष का हकदार है ?'

- The workman remained absent on 12-10-98, 7-1-99, 17-3-99 and 20-5-99. It seems that workman is not interested in the present case. The Award is given in favour of the Management. Parties to bear their own costs.
- Copies of the Award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2572.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जनरल मैनेजर, व्हीकल फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/9/92-आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2572.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of General Manager, Vehicle Factory, Jabalpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-14011/9/92-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer : Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (12)/94

1. Shri Narendra Kumar,
S/o Kandhilal and 27 others,
C/o Shri B. Guha Thakurta,
General Secretary,
Vehicle Factory, Jabalpur,
Qr. No. 2200,
Vehicle Factory Estate,
Jabalpur (M.P.). ... Union.

V/s.

1. Government of India through
Secretary, Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.
2. General Manager,
Vehicle Factory: Jabalpur,
Jabalpur, (M.P.). ... Management.

AWARD

Delivered on this 27th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-14011/9/92/I.R. (D.U.) dated 23-08-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:

अनुसूची

“यथा प्रबंधन विहकल फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर (म. प्र.) के प्रबंधकों द्वारा निम्नलिखित दैनिक वेतन पर कार्यरत स्वीपरो की सेवायें दिनांक 25.05.92 से समाप्त किये जाने की कार्यवाही न्याययोचित है। यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार के हैं।”

क्र.

1. श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार अकंधीलाल
2. श्री नन्दलाल आत्मज किशोरीलाल
3. बन्नीप्रसाद आत्मज भोलप्रसाद
4. मदनलाल आत्मज लल्ला प्रसाद
5. श्री हीरालाल कंधीलाल
6. श्री ओमप्रकाश आत्मज खेतली
7. श्री गणेश अ. महावीर प्रसाद
8. श्री सुभाष आत्मज सोनेलाल
9. श्री मोहन आत्मज लोहाररी
10. श्री शंकरलाल आत्मज नन्हेलाल
11. श्री पुरुषोत्तम आत्मज इमरताल
12. श्री रोहिणीप्रसाद आत्मज मोहनलाल
13. श्री आर. श्याम आत्मज राजेन्द्रन
14. श्री कृष्णकांत आत्मज इंद्रपाल
15. श्री बबलू आत्मज परसराम
16. श्री रमेश आत्मज मंगल प्रसाद
17. श्री रामेश्वर आत्मज छोटेलाल
18. श्री रामविशाल आत्मज सोनेलाल
19. श्री राधे आत्मज पुसऊ
20. श्री राजू आत्मज प्रेमलाल
21. श्री कालीचरण आत्मज गोपाली
22. श्री गंगाराम आत्मज बड़का हरदेव
23. श्री दर्शनलाल आत्मज ननकू
24. श्री धनीराम आत्मज जियालाल
25. श्री शंकरलाल आत्मज छेदीलाल
26. श्री लक्ष्मणप्रसाद आत्मज रामप्रसाद
27. श्री विश्वनाथ आत्मज तुलई
28. श्री राजेन्द्रकुमार आत्मज शिवदास

2. The case of the Union is that the workman were appointed as Class IV Employees in the Cadre of Sweeper from 1983 in the different dates. They have worked as full time sweepers but they have been paid on daily wages. Each of the workman has completed 240 days of service in one year, hence they are entitled to be regularised. The duty hours of the workman were from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m. The work done by them was same which was being done by the permanent employees of the management. Without any reason the services of the workman were terminated from 25-4-92. This actually amounts to retrenchment. Prior to termination the workman were not given notice. They have also not paid retrenchment compensation. The termination of the workman is illegal. The Union claims cancellation of the termination order and payment of back wages.

3. According to the management the workman were employed on temporary basis on daily wages. They were not appointed in the regular vacancy. None of the workman was engaged for full time. The services of the workman were casual in nature. As the services were no longer required and in accordance to the order of the Ordnance Factory Board the management discontinued the services of workman from 25-4-92. There was no need to give notice of termination and retrenchment compensation. The services of the workman came to an end. The workman are not entitled to any relief. None of the workman has completed 240 days

in a calendar year. The termination of the workman is not retrenchment. The management prays that the reference be ordered in their favour.

4. The workmen were performing the duties of sweeper, which is cleaning the building and compounds. This work is that of permanent nature and it will remain in existence as long as the management will function.

5. Shri S. K. Mishra is the Works Manager of the management and he has been cross examined on his affidavit. He has stated in para 6 of his affidavit that the workman were asked to work for 29 days at one time. The wages of Sunday was not been paid to the workman. They were paid wages once a month. Thus the management has created the break in service. This is not real but artificial. The workman were subjected to artificial break in order to deprive them from permanent employment and wages.

6. The statement Ex. W-1 shows the number of days each workman has worked with the management. This is from 1985 to 1991. In the year 1991 each workman has worked for more than 240 days. The same is true for the years 1989 and 1990. From 1980 to 1991, the workman has worked for more than 240 days. This does not include the Sundays and other public holidays. Thus each workman has acquired the status of a workman as defined under Section 25(B) of the ID Act.

7. Workman Narendra Kumar has filed his affidavit. In cross examination he has stated that his name was sponsored by the Employment Exchange and he was interviewed. He has stated that he has worked from 85 to April, 1992.

8. Workman Ram Vishal has filed his affidavit. He has stated in cross examination in para 16 that on the basis of the card of Employment Exchange he was given a job by the management. The management has got his Medical Examination and Verification of his character done by the Police. He has denied the suggestion of the management that his work was of temporary nature and he was employed for sometime.

9. The management has stated in para 5 of their written statement that in accordance with the order of Ordnance Factory Board, the management discontinued taking services from the workman w.e.f. 25-4-92. Thus the decision to remove the workman was that of the Ordnance Factory Board. The present management has only acted mechanically and in complete disregard to the provisions of 25(F) of the ID Act.

10. The copy of the order of Works Manager dated 11-6-92 and copy of another order dated 15-6-92 makes it clear that the work which the workman were doing were given to contractors. Thus the work which workman were doing is being done by the contractors in the year 1992.

11. The workman were not given notice of retrenchment and retrenchment compensation. They have completed 240 days service in one calendar year and hence their termination is against the provisions of 25(F) of the ID Act. Thus the termination order dated 25-4-92 is illegal.

12. The award is given in favour of the workman. The order of termination dated 25-4-92 in respect of workman enumerated in the reference is set aside. The workman would deemed to be in the same job continuously. Since the workman were forced to leave the job. They are entitled to wages and allowances from 25-4-92 till date. This be paid to them within 3 months from the date of the publication of the award. If this is not done the workman will be entitled to interest on this amount @ 12 per cent p.a. Management to pay Rs. 5000 as cost to workman.

13. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2573— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947
(1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार
डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैनेजर टेलीकॉम, भोपाल के प्रवर्धन के संबंध

नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40011/12/89 डी 2(बी)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2573.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of District Manager Telecom, Bhopal and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-40011/12/89/D-2(B)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer
ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. CGIT/LC (R) (66)/90

Shri Rambabu Tiwari represented through
The Circle Secretary,
Bharatiya Telephone Karmachari Sangh (B.M.S.)
44/26, South T.T. Nagar,
Bhopal (M.P.) .. Workman

V/s.

The District Manager,
Telecom,
Central Telegraph Office,
C.T.O. Building,
Bhopal (M.P.) Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 1st day of July 1999

Delivered on this 1st day of July, 1999
its order no. L-40011/12/89-D-2(B), dated 21-2-90
has referred the following dispute for adjudication
by this Court:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of the District Manager Telecom, Bhopal in terminating the services of Shri Anirudh Singh, Kailash Sharma, Jeevan Lal and Rambabu Tiwari is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The copy of reference was sent to Circle Secretary Bharatiya Telephone Karmachari Sangh (B.M.S.), South T.T. Nagar, Bhopal. In this very address summons by this Court was sent. Only one of the workman Rambabu Tiwari filed a statement of claim. It has been stated in the statement of claim that Anirudh Singh has got a permanent job with L.I.C. Bhopal, Shri Kailash Sharma died on 18-06-90. Shri Jeevan Lal is not traceable. This award is related only to workman Rambabu Tiwari.

On the 9-3-99 this case was posted for no dispute award. On the same date the Advocate for workman appeared and this case was restored and posted for evidence of workman on 4-5-99. On 4-5-99 the workman remained absent and again the case was posted for no dispute award. It seems

that Shri Rambabu Tiwari is not interested in Prosecuting this case. Award is given in favour of the Management Parties to bear their own costs.

2. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2574 — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सीनियर सुपरिन्टेंडेंट आफ पोस्ट आफिस, नागपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/164/90 आई आर/डी]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2574.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sr. Supdt. of Post Office, Nagpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/164/90-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer
ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R) 90/91

Shri Gangadhar Motiram Borikar,
R/o At & Post Musewadi,
Teh. Ramtak,

V/s.

Distt. Nagpur Workman
The Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices,
'Mf' Division,
Distt. Nagpur Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 1st day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order No. 40012/164/90-IR (DU), dated 19-4-91 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Court:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Sr. Supdt. of Post Office, Nagpur in terminating Shri Gangadhar Motiram Borikar from the services of the Postal Department is justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. On 26-4-99 the workman remained absent. From that date till today the workman has not approached this Court to set aside ex parte order. This shows that the workman is not

interested in prosecuting the dispute. Award is given in favour of the Management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2575.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सब-डिवीजनल ऑफिसर (टेलीकाम) वारधा के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/156/91-आई आर (डीयू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2575.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Divisional Officer (Telecom), Wardha and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/156/91-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) (43)/92

Shri Shivdas Chahadeorao Taksande,
R/o Madani
P.O. Sewagram,
Distt. Wardha ... Workman

V/s.

The Sub-Divisional Officer
(Telcom), Wardha ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 16th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/156/91-IR(DU), dt. 26-2-92/43 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Sub-Divisional Officer (Telecom), Wardha in terminating the services of Shri Shivdas C. Taksande is justified ? If not, what relief he is entitled to ?"

2. On 29-6-99 management witness Shree Neelkanth Ramji Wankhede was present for cross examination on his affidavit. The workman remained absent. Because of this the cross examination of witness did not take place. It was gathered that the workman is not interested in prosecuting the present case. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ 2576.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार असिस्टेंट सुपरिन्टेंडेंट टेलीग्राफ ट्रैफिक, डी.टी.ओ., बिलासपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/123/92-आई आर (डीयू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2576.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Asstt. Supdt., Telegraph Traffic, D.T.O., Bilaspur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/123/92-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) 209/93

Shri Ram Kumar Gond,
S/o Shri Sahar Singh Gond,
Gram/Post : Hardikalatona,
Distt. Bilaspur ... Workman

V/s.

The Asstt. Supdt.,
Telegraph Traffic,
D.T.O.,
P.O. & Distt. Bilaspur. ... Management

AWARD

Delivered of this 29th day of June, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/123/92-IR(DU) dt. 30-9-93 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management on Asstt. Supdt. Telegraph Traffic, DTO, Bilaspur in retrenching Shri Ram Kumar Gond, s/o Shri Sahar Singh Gond w.e.f. 7-8-90 is legal and justified - If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to ?”

2. The workman remained absent on 7-8-98, 9-10-98, 11-1-99 and 17-3-99. It seems that he is not interested in pursuing the present matter. Award is given in favour of management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent of Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2577.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रिन्सिपल, केन्द्रीय विद्यालय, आर्डिनेन्स फैक्ट्री, कटनी के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/163/92-आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2577.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Principal, Kendriya Vidyalaya, Ordnance Factory, Katni and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-42012/163/92-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer : Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (250)/93

1. The Principal,
Kendriya Vidhyalaya No. 1,
Ordnance Factory, Katni,
District Jabalpur (M.P.).
2. The Assistant Commissioner,
Kendriya Viddhyalaya,
T. T. Nagar,
Near Maida Mill,
Bhopal (M.P.).

Management.

Versus

1. Shri Phoolchand Rai,
S/o Shri B. L. Rai,
Gram, Post Kanwara,
Teh : Katni,
Jabalpur (M.P.).

Union.

AWARD

Delivered on this 29th day of June, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-42012/163/92-IR (D.U.) dated 16-12-93 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management of Principal, Central School, Ordnance Factory, Katni in terminating the services of Shri Phoolchand Rai, Ex-Watchman w.e.f. 30-4-83 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?”

2. The workman remained absent on 15-9-98, 27-11-98, 24-2-99 and 28-4-99. It seems he is not interested to pursue this matter. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 257.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सब डिवीजनल आफिसर, टेलीकॉम, वार्द्धा के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/190/91 आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O.2578.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Divisional Officer, Telecom, Wardha and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/190/91-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer : Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (90)/(99)

Shri Suresh Nathuji Bhagat,
R/o Ramnagar,
Ward No. 1,
Wardha.

... Union.

Vs.

The Sub-Divisional Officer
(Telecom), Wardha

... Management.

AWARD

Delivered on this 15th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/190/91-IR (DU), dated 8-5-92 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Sub-Divisional Officer (Telecom), Wardha in terminating the services of Shri Suresh Nathuji Bhagat, casual labour, is justified? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"

2. On 29-6-99, the management filed an application stating that the workman Suresh Nathuji Bhagat, casual labour has died in the year 1991-92. This fact has not been rebutted by the L.R. of the workman. No dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India, as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2579.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सब-डिवीजनल आफिसर (टी) वार्धा के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/207/91-आई आर/(डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2579.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Divisional Officer (T), Wardha and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/207/91-IR (DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer : Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (139)/92

Shri Harichand M. Pagote,
R/o Gajanan Nagar,
Near Arvi Naka,

Wardha.

... Workman.

Vs.

The Sub-Divisional Officer (T),
Wardha.

... Management.

AWARD

Delivered on this 16th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. 40012/207-91-IR (DU), dated 25-6-92 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of SDO(T), Wardha in terminating the services of Shri Harichand M. Pagote w.e.f. 18-5-87 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

2. The workman remained absent on 2-12-98, 8-3-99 and 29-6-99. The workman has been granted time to file rejoinder and documents since 20-7-95. It gathers that the workman is not interested in prosecuting the present reference. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties of to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2580.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूरसंचार विभाग के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/213/92-आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2580.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Department of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/213/92-IR (DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE-

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)
Presiding Officer : Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (34)/94

Shri Teraslal,
S/o Shri Ram Kripal,
Represented through Shri L. D. Sharma,
Secretary,

Akhil Bharatiya Door Sanchar
Karamchari Sangh,

Jabalpur-Chhindwara Division,
C.T.O. Compound,
Jabalpur.

.. Union.

V/s.

The Sub-Divisional Officer (Telegraphs),
Behind Gajenand Talkies,
Katni,
District Jabalpur,
The District Engineer,
Telecom,
Wright Town,
Jabalpur

... Workman.

AWARD

Delivered on this 21st day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its
Order No. L-40012/213/92-IR (D.U.), dated 12-4-94 has re-
ferred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Divisional
Engineer, Telecom, Jabalpur (M.P.) in terminating
the services of Shri Teraslal, S/o Shri Ram Kripal,
ex-casual labour w.e.f. 1-5-1990 is justified? If
not, what relief he is entitled to?"

2. The workman remained absent on 20-5-99 and 15-7-99.
It seems he is not interested in prosecuting the present case.
Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to
bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour,
Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त 1999

का.आ. 2581.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947
(1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय
सरकार सब डिवीजनल आफिसर (टी) वारधा के प्रबन्ध-
तंत्र के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनु-
बन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक
अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो
केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/230/91-आई (आर डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 1999

S.O. 2581.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Cen-
tral Government hereby publishes the Award of the
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as
2564 GI/99—30.

shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute
between the employers in relation to the management
of Sub-Divisional Officer (T), Wardha and their work-
man, which was received by the Central Government
on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/230/91-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. : CGIT/LC (R) (10)/93

Shri Jiwan Kishanrao Bhagat,
At Wadad,
PO, Selsus,
Tah. and Distt. Wardha

.. Workman

V/s.

The Sub-Divisional Officer (T) .. Management
Wardha

AWARD

Delivered on this 16th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour
vide its order no. : L-40012/230/91/IR (DU), dated
7-1-93 has referred the following dispute for adjudica-
tion by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Sub
Divisional Officer (T) Wardha in terminating
the services of Shri Jiwan Kisanrao Bhagat,
is legal and justified? If not, what relief
he is entitled to?"

2. The workman remained absent on 6-9-99 and
30-6-99. It seems that the workman is not interested
in prosecuting the present case. Award is given in
favour of the management. Parties to bear their own
costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of
Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का.आ. 2582.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947
(1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय
सरकार दूरसंचार विभाग के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबंध नियोजकों
और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट
औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण,
जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय
सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/242/92-आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999.

S.O. 2582.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/242/92-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

Case No. : CGIT/LC/(56)/94

Shri Arun Namdeo Awle,
R/o Juni Mangalwari,
Near Buddha Vihar,
Nagpur ... Workman

V/s

The Sub-Divisional Officer
(Telecom) Phones,
Main-I

C. T. O. Compound,
Nagpur ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 12th day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. : L-40012/242/92-IR (DU), dated 5-5-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Telecom Nagpur in not granting temporary status and reinstatement in service with full back wages to Shri Arun Awle, workman is proper legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?"

2. The workman remained absent on 4-12-98, 10-3-98 and 6-5-99 even after knowledge of hearing of the case. Workman is not interested in pursuing the present matter. Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

ई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2586.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती सरकार को 26-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.—40012/250/92—आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2583.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/250/92-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT
CASE NO. : CGIT/LC (R) 60/94

Shri Manoj Kumar
S/o Shri Dinanath Pille,
C/o The Divisional Secretary,
Akhil Bharatiya Tar Yantri,

Karamchari Union,
Line Staff and Chaturth Shreni,
Phadnis Complex
Indore (M.P.) ... Union

V/s.

Deputy General Manager (Telecom)
Indore Telephones.

Indore (M.P.) ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 14th day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order no. L-40012/250(92) IR (DU) dt. 13-5-94/9-5-97 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Vis.

"Whether the action of the Dy. General Manager, Telecom, Deptt. of Telecommunication, Indore Telephones Indore, in retrenching the service of Shri Manoj Kumar S/o of Shri Dinanath Pille w.e.f. 25-1-90 is justified ? If not what relief he is entitled to?"

Deputy General Manager (Telecom),
Indore Telephones,
Indore (M.P.) .. Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 13th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order no. : L-40012/252/92 IR (D.U.) dt. 13-5-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Dy. General Manager, Telecom, Deptt. of Telecommunication, Indore Telephones, Indore in retrenching the services of Shri Antar Singh S/o Sh. Sawant-ram Singh w.e.f. 26-1-90 is justified ? If not what relief he is entitled to ?"

2. On 12-2-99 Advocate for the workman informed that the workman has been given the job and the dispute is settled outside the Court. In view of this fact no dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India, as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2584.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.—40012/252/92—आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2584.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/252/92-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. : CGIT/LC (R) (77)/94

Antar Singh S/o Sawantran Singh,
The Divisional Secretary,
C/o Akhil Bharatiya Tar Yantrik,
Karamchari Union,
Line Staff and Chaturth Shreni,
88, M. G. Road,
Phadnic Complex,
Indore (M.P.)

Union

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2585.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.—40012/258/92—आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2585.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/258/92-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. CGIT/LC (R) (65)94

Narain Singh S/o Balu Singh,
The Divisional Secretary,
C/o Akhil Bharatiya Tar Yantrik
Karamchari Union,
Line Staff and Chaturth Shreni
88, M. G. Road,
Phadnis Complex,
Indore (M.P.)

.. Union

V/s.

Deputy General Manager (Telecom),
Indore Telephones,
Indore (M.P.)

.. Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 13th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour
vide its order no. : L-40012/258/92 IR (D.U.)
dt. 10-5-94 has referred the following dispute for ad-
judication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Dy. General Mana-
ger, Telecom, Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Indore Telephones, Indore in retrenching the
services of Shri Narain Singh S/o Sh. Balu
Singh w.e.f. 26-1-90 is justified ? If not
what relief he is entitled to ?”

2. On 12-2-99 Advocate for the workman informed
that the workman has been given the job and the dis-
pute is settled outside the Court. In view of this fact
no dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own
costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of
Labour, Government of India, as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2586:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम,
1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण
में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग, के प्रबन्धतंत्र के
संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में
निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक,
अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है।
जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था

[सं. एल.—40012/261/92—आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2586.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the
Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Cen-
tral Government hereby publishes the Award of the
Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as
shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute
between the employers in relation to the management
of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was
received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/261/92-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. CGIT/LC (R) (76)94

Basant Singh S/o Bihari Singh,
The Divisional Secretary,
Akhil Bharatiya Tar Yantrik,
Karamchari Union,
Line Staff and Chatrth Shreni
88, M. G. Road,
Phadnis Complex,
Indore (M.P.)

.. Union

V/s.

Deputy General Manager (Telecom)
Indore Telephones,
Indore (M.P.)

.. Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 13th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of
Labour vide its order no. : L-40012/261/92 IR (DU)
dt. 13-5-94 has referred the following dispute for ad-
judication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Dy. General Manager,
Telecom, Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Indore Telephones, Indore in retrenching
the services of Shri Basant Singh S/o Shri
Bihari Singh w.e.f. 26-1-90 is justified ? If
not what relief he is entitled to ?”

2. On 12-2-99 Advocate for the workman informed
that the workman has been given the job and the dis-
pute is settled outside the Court. In view of this fact
no dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own
costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of
Labour, Government of India, as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

SCHEDULE

का. आ. 2587.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.—40012/265/92-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2587.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of D/o Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/265/92-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (52)/94

Shri Narendra Singh
S/o Sh. Durgesh Singh
C/o The Divisional Secretary,
Akhil Bharatiya Tar Yantrik
Karamchhari Union,
Line Staff and Chaturth Shreni,
88, M. G. Road,
Phadnis Complex,
Indore (M.P.)

... Union

V/s.

Deputy General Manager (Telecom)
Indore Telephones
Indore (M.P.)

... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 14th day of July 1999.

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/265/92-IR(DU) dt. 5-5-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the Dy. General Manager, Telecom, Deptt. of Telecommunication, Indore Telephones, Indore in retrenching the services of Shri Narendra Singh S/o Sh. Durgesh Singh w.e.f. 26-1-1990 is justified ? If not, what relief he is entitled to ?”

2. On 12-2-99 Advocate for workman informed that the workman Shri Narendra Singh S/o Shri Durgesh Singh has been proved by a job management and thus dispute has been settled outside the Court. In view of this fact no dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India, as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2588.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.—42012/16/97-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2588.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Director, Central Institute of Cotton Research and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-42012/16/97-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (321)/97

Shri Rajesh Marotrao Ingole,
At post : Manakapur,
Zingabai Takli,
Ward No. 80,
Tal : Dist. Nagpur

... Workman

V/s

ANNEXURE

The Director,
Central Institute for Cotton Research,
Post Bag No. 225,
G.P.O., Nagpur ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 2nd day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-42012/16/97-IR(DU), dt. 15-12-97 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Court :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Director, Central Institute of Cotton Research, Nagpur is allegedly terminating the services of their workman Shri Rajesh M. Ingole a skilled labourer driver w.e.f. August, 1995 is just proper and legal ? If not for what relief the workman is entitled to ?"

2. The workman remained absent on 23-3-99 and 26-4-99. It seems that the workman is not interested in prosecuting the present case. The Award is given in favour of management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2589.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण, में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सब-डिविजनल आफिसर, टेलीग्राफ नागपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था ।

[सं. एल.-40012/31/91-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2589.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Divisional Officer, Telegraphs, Nagpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/31/91-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (169)/91

Shri Pradeep Motham Ghayar,
R/o Lalgang,
Itwari, Nagpur. — Workman

V/s

The Sub-Divisional Officer,
Telegraphs,
Nagpur. ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 1st day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/31/91-IR(DU), dt. 25-9-91 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this court :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management is not providing work to Shri P. M. Ghayar, Gasual Mazdoor is justified ? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to ?"

2. The workman remained absent on 4-12-98 and 10-3-99. It seems he is not interested in prosecuting this case. Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2500.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूरसंचार विभाग के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था ।

[सं. एल.-40012/25/97-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2590.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the indus-

trial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/25/91-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (166) 91

Sri S. J. Kamble,
C/o Gopichand Kirana Store,
Near Jayanti Ground,
Rambagh,
Nagpur

... Workman

V/s

The Telecom Distt. Engineer,
T & E,
Bhandara

... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 1st day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/25/91-IR(DU), dt. 22/30-9-91 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Court :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Telecommunication, Bhandara in terminating the services of Shri Siddhartha Lahanuji Kamble w.e.f. 7/86, and not condoning absence of workman on account of sickness in resumption of duties, was justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"

2. The workman remained absent on 4-12-98 and 10-3-99. It seems that the workman is not interested in pursuing the present dispute. Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. मा. 2591:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन, नागपुर के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों

के बीच, अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-40012/129/91-आई आर (डी यू)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2591.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Electrification, Nagpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/129/91-IR(DU)]
KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) 229/91

Shri Tulsidas Maroti,
C/o Adv. Miss Sulekha Kumohare,
Hardas Nagar Kamptee,
Nagpur (MS)

... Workman

V/s

The General Manager,
Telecom Electrification,
Civil Lines,
Nagpur. (MS)

... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 1st day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/129/91-IR(DU), dt. 5-12-91 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Court :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Telecom Electrification Nagpur in terminating the service of Shri Tulsidas Maroti is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

2. The workman remained absent on 2-12-98, 8-3-99 and 5-5-99. It seems that the workman is not interested in prosecuting the present dispute.

Award is given in favour of the Management.
Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2592:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डिब्बीजमल इंजीनियर टेलीकॉम (मालवा), इंदौर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं.प.ल.-40012/37/93-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2592.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Divisional Engineer Telecom (Malwa), Indore and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/37/93-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (103)/94

Shri Brahmanand Parmar,
S/o Shri Rampal Parmar,
House No. 233, Ganpati Marg,
Naugayan, Distt. Dhar (M.P.) ... Workman

V/s

The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom (Malwa)
Shopping Complex, A.V. Road,
Indore (M.P.) ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 13th day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/37/93-IR (DU) dt 22-5-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Divisional Engineer Telecom (Malwa) in terminating the services of Shri Brahmanand Parmar, Muster roll workman w.e.f. April '99 vide circular No. 12E 18 1/R/g/150 dated 20-4-85 is proper, legal and justified - If not what relief the workman is entitled for?"

2. On 12-2-99 Advocate for the workman informed that the workman has been given the job and the dispute is settled outside the Court. In view of this fact no dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2593:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सब-डिविजमल ऑफिसर, नागपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं.प.ल.-40012/32/91-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

Ne Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2593.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Divisional Officer, Telegraphs, Nagpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-99.

[No. L-40012/32/91-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (170)/91

Shri Sagirkhan Munirkhan
R/o C.T.O. Compound,
Civil Lines,
Nagpur ... Workman

V/s

The Sub-Divisional Officer,
Telegraphs,
Nagpur.

... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 12th day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/32/91-IR(DU), dt. 25-9-91, has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Court :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management by not providing work to Shri Sagirkhan Munikhan, Casual Mazdoor is Justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to ?"

2. The workman remained absent on 4-12-98 and 10-3-99. It seems the workman is not interested in prosecuting the present case. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2594:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-40012/87/93-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2594.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 2-8-99.

[No. L-40012/87/93-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

2564 GI/99—31.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(134)/94

1. Shri Mohd Iqbal
S/o Shri Mohd. Rafique
Near Purana Telegraph Office
Ward No. 2,
Distt. Balaghat. ... Workman

V/s.

1. The Chief General Manager,
Telegraph Traffic
Bhopal.
2. The Telegraph Master-in-Charge
Telegraph Office
Balaghat. ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 22nd July day of 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/87/93-IR(DU), dated 15 Sept. '94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Sub-Divisional Officer (Telegraph), Telegraph Office, Balaghat (M.P.) under the control of T.D.E., Mahakoshal, Jabalpur in terminating the services of Shri Mohd. Iqbal, s/o Sh. Mohd. Rafique, Ex Casual Labour, w.e.f. 3-5-90 is justified? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"

2. The case of the workman Mohd. Iqbal is that he worked with the management from 5-10-82 to April 1990. The services of the workman were terminated on 3-5-90. He was told that there is a break in service of one year and hence he is being retrenched. This retrenchment is illegal. The workman is entitled to be regularised. The workman was given temporary status from 1-10-89. The work which the workman was doing is still available. He cannot be retrenched on the ground that there is a break in the service. The people who are junior to the workman in service are still working. The workman prays that the order of termination is illegal and he is entitled to reinstatement and wages.

3. The case of the management is the workman was a casual labour and was engaged whenever required. The regularisation of casual labour is

carried out in accordance of the policies and directions of the Directorate. The workman could not be regularised as he did not fulfil the conditions required for regularisation. The management denies that there has been retrenchment in the case of workman. The provisions of Section 25 (f) of the I. D. Act are not attracted. The termination of workman is in accordance with law. The management prays that the action of the management be declared legal and reference be decided in their favour.

4. Ex W. I shows that the workman was engaged by the management from 4-10-82 as a casual labour. Ex 9 W2 is an Office issued by the Balaghat Office in respect of grant of temporary status to the workman from 1-10-89. Ex W3 is a order of retrenchment issued by management on 3-5-90 stating that there is break of service of 1 year and 10 months from March '85 to December '86 hence he is being retrenched. Ex. W4 is letter written by SDO Telegraph Balaghat and addressed to T.D.E. Jabalpur dated 11-5-90 in which it has been stated that the break in service of the workman is from April '84 to September '84 and March '85 to September '85. A request was made to give relaxation to re-engagement of the workman.

5. The work record of the workman is Ex W7. This shows that the workman has worked from October '82 to April '90 for a period of 1558 days. It shows that in 1989 he worked for 361 days and in 1988 he worked for 335 days.

6. The workman has filed his affidavit and he has been cross examined by the Advocate of the management. In this affidavit he has stated that he is out of employment since termination of service from 3-5-90. In this point there is no cross examination. Hence the workman is believed in this point.

7. The management framed a scheme known as "Casual Labourers (Grant of Temporary status and regularisation Scheme 1980" of the Department of Telecommunication". In para 5 of this Scheme the temporary status is discussed. In para 6, this scheme states that certain benefits will accrue to the casual labour put to this category. The workman was given temporary status from 1-10-89. After granting of temporary status the services of the workman could be dispensed with only on the ground of non availability of the work. In the present case as per retrenchment order W3 the services of the workman were terminated on the ground that there is a break of 1 year and 10 months from March '85 to December '86. A casual labour who has been given temporary status cannot be terminated on this ground. Particularly when this period is wrong as stated in the letter SDO Telegraph Balaghat Ex W4. Thus the reason for retrenchment of the workman is against the scheme of management and contrary to Law.

8. In the year 1989 the workman has put 361 days of continuous service with the management. Thus under Section 25(f) of ID Act. A notice of retrenchment and retrenchment compensation was necessary. This being done, this order of retrenchment is illegal.

9. The order dated W3 is bad in law. It is hereby quashed. The workman will be deemed to be in the service of the management continuously. Management to pay him wages and allowances from 3-5-90 till date. This be done in 3 months time from the date of publication of the Award. If the wages are not paid in 3 months time the workman will be entitled to the interest of the amount @12% p.a. The award is given in favour of the workman. The workman will be entitled to increments and pensionary benefits for this period. Management to pay Rs. 2000/- as cost to workman.

10. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2595:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[नं. एल.-40012/56/93-आई आर (डी व)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2595.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Factory, Jabalpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-8-1999.

[No. L-40012/56/91-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAY VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR

Presiding Officer : Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) 183/91

Shri Chamman Lal,
Ex T. No. 729,
C/o Shri R. C. Shrivastava,
13, South Civil Lines,
Jabalpur (M.P.). ... Workman

V/s.

The General Manager,
Telecom Factory,
Jabalpur, (M.P.). ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 5rd day of August, 1999

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour
vide its Order No. L-40012/56/91-IR(DU), dated
11-10-91 has referred the following dispute for
adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of
Telecom Factory, Jabalpur is justified in
terminating the services of Shri Chamman
Lal, Ex T. No. 729 w.e.f. 7-6-1986 ?
If not, to what relief is the workman
entitled ?"

2. The case of the workman is that he was an
employee of the management in the year 1986. He
was given chargesheet and a Departmental Enquiry
was held against him. The DE Officer found him
guilty of the charge and submitted his report. The
Disciplinary Authority accepted the report of the
DE Officer and dismissed him from service. The
dismissal of the workman is illegal and against
principles of natural justice. It has not been proved
that the property recovered from his possession is
a Government property and the benefits could have
been given to the workman. The procedure follow-
ed in DE is perverse and illegal. The workman wants
the relief of reinstatement and back wages.

3. According to management the present refe-
rence is barred by limitation because the workman
was dismissed on 10-6-86 and he had applied for
conciliation on 12-12-90. The workman was caught
carrying 1175 gms. of copper wire which was the
property of the management on 8-9-84 at 11 a.m.
by the chowkidar at Gate No 4 of Telecom Factory,
Jabalpur. This copper wire has been wrapped in an
old pant and kept in the back carrier of his cycle.
The charge sheet was sent to the workman and he
pleaded not guilty. A departmental Enquiry was held.

In this enquiry the workman participated and was
assisted by a co worker of his choice. Every docu-
ment relating to the misconduct of the workman
was given to him. The co worker of the workman
cross examined the management witness. The DE
Officer found the charge proved and submitted his
report. The Disciplinary Authority dismissed the
workman from service. The Appellate Authority
rejected the appeal of the workman. The procedure
followed in the DE is valid and proper. The punish-
ment given to workman is proportionate to the
misconduct. The management request that the
Award be given in their favour.

4. The Order Sheet of the Court dated 1-11-94
states that the DE paper were admitted by the
workman.

5. This Court by Order dated 29-5-95 has held
that the procedure followed in the enquiry is valid
and proper and according to principles of natural
justice.

6. In the DE the management examined the
following witnesses :

1. Shri Lalji, Chowkidar
2. Shri Munna Singh, Chowkidar
3. Shri N. D. Paneria, Inspector
4. Shri Sarjoo Roy, Chageman

All these witnesses has been cross examined by co
worker of the workman.

7. Shri Lalji, Chowkidar stated that on 8-9-84
at about 11 a.m. at Gate No. 4 the workman wanted
to go out forcibly. He caught the workman with his
cycle and found a bundle of copper wire wrapped
in a old full pant kept in the carrier of the cycle
alongwith a tiffin box. He asked his fellow Chowki-
dar Shri Munna Singh to inform the Assistant
Engineer on telephone. A complete search of the
workman was taken and copper wire weighing about
1175 gms. was recovered from the possession of the
workman.

8. The Statement of Lalji Chowkidar is fully
corroborated by the statement of Shri Munna Singh,
Chowkidar. Both of them stated that copper wire
weighing about 1175 gms. was seized from the
exclusive possession of the workman.

9. Management witness Shri N. D. Paneria also
confirmed the statements of Lalji and Munna Singh.
In presence of Shri Paneria the search of the work-
man was taken and bundle of copper wire was
recovered from the possession of the workman.
Seizure Memo was prepared.

10. Management witness Shri Sarjoo Roy
identified the workman as one of the workers in the
Construction Association.

11. The workman in his statement dated 24-6-86 recovered that he was caught by Lalji Chowkidar who recovered copper wire wrapped in pant. Further in his statement dated 17-7-86 the workman stated that in his cycle carrier was kept alone pant and this contained copper wire. The copper wire was recovered from his possession by Lalji, Chowkidar. Further in the statement of the workman dated 21-8-86 the workman has stated that Lalji, Chowkidar has taken search and recovered copper wire in the pant. Thus according to the statement of the workman dated 24-6-86, 17-7-86 and 21-8-86 Lalji, Chowkidar pulled out an old pant from the cycle carrier and in this pant the copper wire weighing about 1175 gms. was wrapped.

12. I agree with the findings of the DE Officer the management has proved that workman was stealing 1175 gms. of copper wire belonging to management and he was caught red handed at Gate No. 4 by Security Chowkidar.

13. As regards the quantum of punishment the copper wire is a common commodity used in Telecom Factory, Jabalpur. It is a costly item. The theft of management property is a serious misconduct. The punishment of removal of services is adequate looking to the nature of misconduct. I agree with quantum of punishment imposed to workman.

14. The result of above discussions is that the reference is answered in favour of the management. The workman have no case and does not deserve any benefit. Parties to bear their own costs.

15. Copies of the Award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2596.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसर्ण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ०सी०आई०, नागपुर (एम०पी०) के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-42012(24)/85-डी०वी०]

बी० एस० ए० एस० पी० राजू, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2596.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of P. C. I. [Nagpur (M.P.)] and their workman,

which was received by the Central Government on the 18-8-99.

[No. L-42012(24)/85-D.V.]
V.S.A.S.P. RAJU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

CASE NO. : CGIT/LC (R) 8/87

The Secretary,
F.C.I. Employees Association,
C/o Food Corporation of India,
Ajni,
Nagpur (M.P.)

.. Union

V/s.

The Distt. Manager,
Food Corporation of India,
Ajni,
Nagpur (M.P.)

.. Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 3rd day of August, 1999

1. The Government of India Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. : L-42012(24)/85 D. V. dated 22-1-87 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of Food Corporation of India Employees Association, Nagpur for grant of stagnation increment to Class IV Employees after completion of 8 years of service with effect from 1-1-1981 is justified ? If yes to what relief the workmen are entitled and from what date ?”

2. Both the parties filed a Joint Compromise Petition stating that they have settled their dispute out-of-the Court. This fact is ascertained from both the parties.

3. No Dispute Award is given. Parties to bear their own costs.

4. Copies of the Award be sent to Ministry of Labour Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2597.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसर्ण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ०सी०आई० के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-42012(24)/85-डी०वी०]

बी० एस० ए० एस० पी० राजू, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2597.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of S.E.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-22012/530/94-IR.(C-II)]

V.S.A.S.P. RAJU, Desk Officer
ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. : CGIT/LC (R) (93)/95

Shri Awadhraj Singh & Shri Lateram,
Represented through Shri Jagdish Singh,
Gen. Secretary,
Koyla Mazdoor Sabha (UTUC)
Post : Dhanpuri
Distt. Shahdol .. Union

V/s.

The Sub-Area Manager,
Budhar Sub Area,
S.E.C.L.
Post : Dhanpuri,
Distt. Shahdol .. Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 21st day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. : L-22012/530/94 IR (C-II), dated 25-5-95 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

अनुसूची

“क्या प्रबंधक सन एरिया मैनेजर बुद्धार सब एरिया एस.ई.सी.एल. पो. धनपुरी जिला : शहडोल के प्रबंधकों द्वारा श्री अवधराज सिंह टो. नं. 427 एवं श्री लतेराम टो. नं. 279 बुद्धार कालरी नं. 3 को कार्य के अनुभार रेजिग मुंशी के पद पर पदोन्नत नियमितकरण न किये जाने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है यदि नहीं, संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?”

2. The both workman was very casual in attending this case. He remained absent on 12-10-98, 7-1-99, 17-3-99 and 15-7-99. No dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the Award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

कांआ० 2598.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०ई०सी०एल० के प्रबंधक के मध्यस्थ नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में विहित औद्योगिक

विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/355/95-आई०आर० (सी०-II)]

वी० एस० ए० एस० पी० राजू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2598.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of S.E.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-22012/355/95-I.R.(C-II)]

V.S.A.S.P. RAJU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO : CGIT/LC (R) 189/96

Shri Dhani Ram,
Represented through The General Secretary,
Chhatisgarh Khadan Kharkhana,
Mazdoor Union,
Banki Mogre,
Distt. Bilaspur, UNION

V/s.

The Sub Area Manager,
SECL Kusumunda Project,
Distt. Bilaspur MANAGEMENT

AWARD

Delivered on this 2nd day of August 1999

The Government of India Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012/355/95 I.R. (C-II), dated 26-9-96 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of SECL, Kusumunda Project Bilaspur in not granting LTC, increment to Shri Dhani Ram, E.P. Fitter Grade I is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?”

1. The admitted facts of the case that Sri Dhani Ram is E.P. Fitter Grade I in Kusumunda project of the SECL. He is entitled to LTC once in four years for four members of his family from place of work to his permanent address i.e. village Gatwar, Tehsil Ghumarwin, Distt. Bilaspur (Himachal Pradesh). He had joined the services from 6-6-81. The mother of the workman Smt. Suharu Devi expired on 10-7-87. In 1984 the workman availed of the LTC facility and he had charged Railway Fare for four people as under :

1. Shri Dhani Ram Self
2. Smt. Suharu Devi Mother
3. Smt. Kalan Devi Wife
4. Kum. Nirmala Devi Daughter

2. In the year 1997 the workman was paid LTC for self, wife Kalan Devi, and daughter Kum. Nirmala Devi. A Departmental enquiry was held against the workman. In this enquiry the workman pleaded guilty and the D E Officer send the report. The workman has been punished :

- (a) The amount which he has taken by way of LTC was recovered from his salary.
- (b) One increment of the workman was stopped with cumulative effect.

The workman will not get any wages for the period of suspension.

3. The case of workman is that he has got two wives. The senior one named Smt. Kalan Devi and second one Smt. Bhanga Devi. From Bhanga Devi he has got two sons, Wimal Kumar and Bhim Chand and two daughters Kum. Pramila and Kum. Manorama. Smt. Bhanga Devi has given birth to all the children in the hospital run by the management at Kusumunda Colliery. Thus it was in the Knowledge of the management that Smt. Bhanga Devi is the wife of the workman since the birth of first child on 23-2-84. On 14-8-93 the workman submitted an application to correct his family particulars in which he mentioned the name of his wife is Smt. Bhanga Devi and his mother Smt. Suharu Devi is living with him and is dependent upon him. Another application dated 28-3-93 was given by the workman to delete the name of his mother who is dead and to include the name of his daughter Kum. Nirmala in the list of family members. On 8-7-91 the Management issued Certified Standing Orders. These order restricted the second marriage of the employees in case the first wife was alive. The workman asserts that he married Smt. Bhanga Devi prior to the year 1984. Thus the rules framed under Standing Order has no application in this case. The management gave chargesheet to workman on 11-9-1993 in which it was alleged that the workman has cheated the management by giving different names in different application about his wife. The second charge was that he has married second time even though his first wife was alive. The third charge was that the action of the workman has created an atmosphere of indiscipline. The workman replied to these charges and explained his position. The workman was suspended from 11-9-93. A Departmental Enquiry was held by Shri R. P. Khare. The enquiry Officer induced the workman to accept the charges on assurance that he will not be punished on his admission. The workman pleaded guilty. After a lapse of about a year and a half on 6-4-95 the order of punishment has been passed. The punishment is excessive of the misconduct. The management is not competent to ignore the presence of his second wife when the workman has married before coming into force of the Certified Standing Order. Thus no punishment can be inflicted on this ground. The workman has not cheated the management in respect of LTC. The workman wants that punishment order dated 6-4-95 be quashed.

4. The case of the management is that the workman was giving different family particulars on different dates. He has married second time which is against Certified Standing Order of the management. Thus he has committed misconduct. He had tried to cheat the management by giving false details about his family. The workman has knowingly and consciously admitted the charges in the DE. There was no inducement to the workman to admit the charges. The punishment given to the workman is just and proper. The management wants this reference be answered in its favour with cost.

5. The Certified Standing Orders of the management came into force from 8-7-91. For the first time an employee was prohibited for second marriage in the event of his first wife was living. This was a misconduct only from 8-7-91. It is for the workman to prove he has married Smt. Bhanga Devi prior to this date. The workman failed to prove the date of marriage with Smt. Bhanga Devi.

6. The workman has pleaded guilty before the DE Officer. The report of the DE Officer is Ex M 11 dated 14-3-94. It clearly states that in the presence of his co worker workman pleaded guilty. The burden was on the workman to prove that the DE Officer has given him assurance that the action will be taken against him. No documentary Evidence has been produced in this respect. The workman has not examined himself to prove this point. Thus the workman failed to prove that he pleaded guilty to charges on assurance that no action will be taken against him.

7. It has been argued by the Union that since the workman belongs to Schedule Caste Community. He is not familiar with the procedure of the management and as such he has given different information at different times. I do not agree with this contention. The rules of conduct is same for every employee. To take shelter of the fact that he belongs to Schedule Caste is not permissible. The workman has married second time when his first wife is alive. As per application dated 28-7-93 the workman wants his family to include himself, second wife Bhanga Devi, his daughter Kum.

Nirmala from the first wife, his two sons and two daughter from the second wife. Surprisingly in this application dated 28-8-93 he has not mentioned that his family includes his first wife Kalan Devi. For the sake of arguments if the workman was right in believing that his second wife is legally married then it is difficult to appreciate why did he not mention the name of his first wife in his application dated 28-8-93. This conduct of the workman fully establishes his criminal intention. Thus by the Documentary Evidence available with management and the admission of the workman before the DE Officer the misconduct of the workman alleged in the chargesheet dated 11-9-93 is proved.

8. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report on 14-3-93. Action has been taken against the workman by the order dated 6-4-95. It has taken about 2 years by the management to pass punishment order in a DE in which the workman has pleaded guilty. One of the punishment inflicted upon the workman is that he will not be paid wages for the period of suspension other than what he got as subsistence allowance. The delay in the punishment order is due to the negligence of the management. As such the workman cannot be deprived of his wages for suspension period. This part of the punishment order is not logical. It is quashed.

9. The second punishment given to the workman is that the amount of LTC paid to him be recovered from his salary. What is gathered by the record filed by the management is that the workman was paid first LTC in the year 1984. At that time his mother was alive and he has declared his wife's name as Kalan Devi and daughter's name as Nirmala Devi. Thus the amount charged in 1984 is in respect of the workman, his mother, his first wife Kalan Devi and daughter Kum. Nirmala. This is the recognised family of the workman hence the amount claimed by him for LTC in the year 1984 is within rules and valid. This cannot be realised back from the workman.

10. The second LTC claimed by the workman in the year 1984 is in respect of himself his first wife Kalan Devi, his daughter Kum. Nirmala and brother Jeet Ram. The management has paid the workman in regard to LTC for year 1987 for workman, his first wife Kalan Devi and first wife's daughter Kum. Nirmala. Thus again the payment is regular and according to rules. This amount also cannot be taken back from the workman.

11. These are the two amounts of LTC which has been paid to workman. Both are proper and regular. Thus the order of recovery from salary of the workman of the amount of LTC paid to him is illegal. It is quashed.

12. The Award is given in favour of management with modifications. The amount of two LTC paid to workman will not be recovered from his salary. For the period of suspension the workman will be paid full wages and allowances. The order of management to stop increment with cumulative effect is confirmed. Parties to bear their own costs.

13. Copies of the Award be sent Ministry of Labour Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

कां० 2599.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त सी०एल० के प्रबन्धन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कार्यकर्ता के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिनियम, जवनपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[गोपनीय १९९९/१९९९/९३-आर्डीआर० (सी०-1)]

१० एल० ए० एल० पी० राजू, डेप्टी सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2599.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-1999.

[No. L-22012/223/93-IR-(C-II)]

V.S.A.S.P. RAJU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT JABALPUR (M.P.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R) (239)/93

Manager,
Chandametta Colliery,
W.C.L. Pench Area,
P.O. Chandametta Colliery,
Chhindwara (M.P.)

Vs.

Management

General Secretary,
S.K.M.S. (AITUC),
P.O. Chandametta,
Chhindwara (M.P.)

Union

AWARD

Delivered on this 29th day of June 1999
The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order no. L-22012/223/93-IR (C-II) dated 12-11-93 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal:

"Whether the action of the Sub Area Manager, Newton, Newton Sub Area WCL, Pench Area, PO Newton Chikli, Dist. Chhindwara (M.P.) in dismissing the services of Shri Ramdhar S/o Chokat Tub Loader, T. No. 1516, Chandametta Colliery w.e.f. 2-12-91 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. On 2-6-99 the workman and the management filed a joint application that they have settled their dispute outside the Court. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

कांआ० 2600.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ०सी०आई० के प्रबन्धन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुव्यय में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[नं० एल-12012/204/एफ०/90-आई०आर० (कोल II)]

वी० एस० ए० एस० पी० राजू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2600.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government

hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of F.C.I. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-99.

[No. L-22012/204/F/90-IR (Coal-II)]

V.S.A.S.P. RAJU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT JABALPUR (M.P.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D.N. DIXIT
CASE NO. CGIT/LC (R) (143)/91

Shri B.D. Jha,
The Zonal President,
Food Corporation of India,
Employees Association,
Rudrax B.T.I. Road,
Vidisha.

Workman

Vs.

The Zonal Manager (W)
Food Corporation of India,
Bombay Mistry Bhavan,
Bombay.

Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 3rd day of August, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order No. L-22012/204/F/90-IR (Coal-II), dated 5-8-1991 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Zonal Manager (West) F.C.I. Bombay vide letter No. V&S 7(2)/83/20 dated 20-9-85 for compulsory retirement of Shri B. D. Jha, Asstt. Manager (Depot) is justified or not? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. A preliminary issue was framed at the instance of management as follows:

"Whether the applicant is a workman under Section 2(S) of the I.D. Act?"

3. The contention of the workman is that he was not performing the managerial and administrative functions. His work is not of supervisory nature. His contention is that he is a workman covered under section 2(s) of the I.D. Act.

4. The contention of the management is that the duties of the workman are defined by Food Corporation of India in the duty chart which is Ex. M1. He was sole incharge of the depot. The employees working under him were under his supervision and control. He was allotting duties to the persons posted in the depot. He was taking independent decisions. He was granting leave. He was writing Annual Confidential Report. On the date of his termination Shri B. D. Jha was drawing a monthly salary of more than Rs. 1600.00 p.m. the management wants that it be declared that Shri B. D. Jha was not workman. The present reference be answered in favour of the management.

5. The management has examined Shri Kesar Singh District Manager F.C.I. to prove their contention. Ex. M1 is about the duty of Assistant Manager. It mentions that the Assistant Manager are empowered to grant to Casual Leave. They make performance appraisals. They scrutinise incoming and outgoing letters and take action on them. They have to allocate work to their subordinate. They guide and advise the personnel working under them. They maintain disciplinary control over their subordinate.

6. The duty of Assistant Manager is separately given in Ex. M1

7. Shri Kesar Singh has stated in para 22 that in Food Corporation of India the work appraisal of class III and IV is recorded by Assistant Manager. Then it is submitted to District Manager for review. This clearly shows that the Assistant Manager in Food Corporation of India has powers of supervision and control.

8. The documents filed by the management in Ex. M I, M II, M III, M IV and M V shows that the Assistant Manager is capable of taking independent decision in respect of work of the employees posted under him. He was also issuing direction to the staff working under him. This is clear by documents in Ex. M V, M VI & M VII.

9. In the depot Shri B. D. Jha was granting a casual leave to the employee working under him. This is clear by documents Ex. M 9, 10.

10. Shri B. D. Jha has recorded the Confidential Report of employees in form Ex M 11. The actual nature of functions and duties discharge by the employees and the powers exercised by Shri B. D. Jha are clear from the records filed by the management. The power to grant leave, the power to write appraisal, power to take independent decision were vested in Shri B. D. Jha. The clearly shows that he was acting in managerial and administrative functions. Shri B. D. Jha was working as Assistant Manager, FCI at the time his services were terminated. At that particular time he was watching the work being done and to see that it is performed properly.

11. I hold that Shri B. D. Jha at the time of termination was not a workman under section 2(s) of the I.D. Act. The consequence of this finding is that this Court has no jurisdiction to decide the present reference. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

12. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2601.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इन्ड्यूस्त्रीएल (नागपुर) के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं०एल० 22012/191/94 आई०आर० (सी०-1)]

बी०एस० ए०एस० पी० राजू, डस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2601.-In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C.L. (Nagpur) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-8-99.

[No. L-22012/191/94-IR(C-II)]

V. S. A. S. F. RAJU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT JABALPUR (M.F.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT
CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R)(176)/94

Shri Kalidas Tarachand Tandekar,
Ward No. 2,
Main Road,
Bada Beena,
Tehsil Kamptee,
Distt. Nagpur.

.. Workman

V/s.

Sub-Area Manager,
Western Coalfield Limited,
P.O. Sillewara,
Distt. Nagpur.

... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 12th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012(191)/94-IR(C-II) dated 31-10-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunals.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Western Coalfields Ltd., Sillewara, Distt. Nagpur (Mah) in dismissing Sh. Kalidas Tarachand Tandekar from his services without any in depth examination of sick leave application medical certificates etc. by the Enquiry Committee is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2 The workman remained absent on 2-12-98, 8-3-99 and 5-5-99. It seems the workman is not interested in prosecuting this case. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2602.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इन्ड्यूस्त्रीएल के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं०एल० 22012/67/94-आई०आर० (सी०-II)]

बी०एस० ए०एस० पी० राजू, डस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2602.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-8-99.

[No. L-22012/67/94-IR(C-II)]

V. S. A. S. P. RAJU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASE NO. CGIT/UC(R)(162)/94

Shri Mahmood Hussain,
R/o The General Secretary,
Bharatiya Koyla Khadan
Mardoor Sangh (B.M.S.),
P.O. Parasfa,
Distt. Chhindwara.

.. Union

The General Manager,
Pench Area of Western
Coalfields Limited,
P.O. Parasfa
Distt. Chhindwara.

.. Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 12th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012/67/94-IR(C-II) dated 19-9-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Rawanwara Khas Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Pench Area, Chhindwara, is justified in terminating the services of Shri Mahmood S/o Shri Rasood Ambulance Driver Rawanwara Khas Colliery with effect from 1-10-85 by order dated 30-7-1988 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. The workmen remained absent on 8-3-99, 5-5-99. The workman has not approached the court to set aside ex-parte order. It seems the workman is not interested in prosecuting the matter. Parties to bear their own costs. Award be given in favour of the management.

3. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour Government of India, as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

कांआ० 2603.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार देना बैंक के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बन्ध मियोजकों और उनके फर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-8-49 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-12012/60/98-आई०आर० (बी०-II)]

सी० गंगाधरण, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2603.—In pursuance of Section 1 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dena Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-8-99.

[No. L-12012/60/98-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SMT. N. J. SHELAT, PRESIDING OFFICER
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CENTRAL, AHMEDABAD
Reference (ITC) No. 108 of 1998

ADJUDICATION

BETWEEN

Dena Bank, Bhavnagar.

.. First Party

AND

The workmen employment under it. .. Second party

In the matter whether the action of the First Party in terminating the services of Shri N.B. Oza vide order dated 3-7-95 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled?

APPEARANCES :

None for the Second party.

AWARD

By an Order No. L-12012/60/98-IR(B-II) dated 4-12-98, the Desk Officer, Ministry of Labour, Government of India, Rofi Marg, New Delhi-110001 has referred an industrial dispute between the above parties u/s. 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as stated in the Schedule of above order for adjudication to this Tribunal.

In spite of services of notice, nobody was remaining present before this Tribunal on behalf of the Second party and, therefore, this Tribunal had to make several adjournments. Ultimately, in order to provide a last opportunity, the matter was fixed for hearing on 22-7-99, but on this day also when called off, neither the Second party or their Representative remanent present nor filed the statement of claim. From this, it is quite clear that the Second party is not interested to proceed with the matter. In the result, I pass following order :—

ORDER

The reference is dismissed for non-prosecution and it is disposed of accordingly with no order as to costs.

N. J. SHELAT, Presiding Officer
Ahmedabad, 31 July, 1999.

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

का०आ० 2604.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार विजया बैंक के प्रबन्धनत्व के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बैंगलूर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-12012/71/93-आई०आर० (बी०-II)]
सी० गंगाधरण, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2604.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Vijaya Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-8-99.

[No. L-12012/71/93-IR(B-II)]
C. GANGADHARAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated the 6th August, 1999

PRESENT :

JUSTICE R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer
C.R. NO. 48/93

I PARTY

The General Secretary,
Vijaya Bank Employees Federation,
220, Cubbonpet Main Road,
Bangalore-560 002.

II PARTY

The Chairman and M.D.
Vijaya Bank, Head Office,
M.G. Road,
Bangalore-560 001.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub section 2A of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide Order No. L-12012/71/93-IR(B-II) dated 16-8-93 for adjudication on the following schedule.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the part of Vijaya Bank in dismissing the service of Sri. K. P. Laxa, Peon from 24-9-90 is justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The I party was appointed as a Peon w.e.f. 22-7-1982. He was attending to his duties regularly. From 1986 onwards this workman developed a tendency of remaining absent to the duty unauthorisedly and he was also in the habit of disobeying the instructions of his Superior officers. Due to this tendency on 29-11-1986 a charge sheet was issued for unauthorised absence and for showing disobedience. Since he has admitted the charges and requested for a lineant view the II party imposed punishment of warning. During 1987 he once again remained unauthorised absence from 18-3-87 to 6-8-87. After conducting an enquiry stoppage of one increment temporarily for a period of six months was imposed.

3. He once again remained absent unauthorisedly in the year 1988 and also started behaving improperly. After conducting an enquiry stoppage of one increment permanently was imposed as punishment. He was once again found absent from 16-11-88 to 6-1-89 again disciplinary proceedings were initiated and stoppage of one increment permanently was imposed as punishment.

4. The above punishment has not improved the tendency of this workman and he once again remained unauthorised absence from 17-4-89 onwards. The II party made a publication in a Kannada newspaper. Consequent to which he has reported for duty on 26-7-89. However, the management issued a charge sheet and once again imposed stoppage of two increments permanently.

5. Lastly, the workman remained again absent from 3-10-89 to 26-12-89. An enquiry was initiated and he avoided to attend the enquiry and all the communication sent to him were returned by the Postal Authorities making endorsement like "Party Left", "Not available", "Not in Station etc.". Therefore the II party conducted the Domestic Enquiry and the misconduct has been proved. On the report of the Enquiry Office and the Disciplinary Authority once again made efforts to send a Second show cause notice with a proposed punishment. Of course this letter was received by the I party but he has not made any representation.

6. After considering the conduct of this workman from a Pretty long period an Order of dismissal was made w.e.f. 24-9-90. The I party opened his eyes for the first time and made an appeal which came to be rejected.

7. The above facts are factually not disputed.

8. The learned Advocate for the I party Sri Ganapathy Hegde, possibly having a clear view of the matter, has filed a Memo conceding the validity of Domestic Enquiry. This Tribunal accepted the Memo and advised parties to address their Arguments on Merits. Documents connected to Domestic Enquiry were marked by consent.

9. The learned Advocate for the II party Smt. Sarvamangala has submitted that this workman caused maximum harassment in the II party Organisation and he is also responsible for dislocating day to day work and therefore he is not entitled for any relief in this dispute.

10. Sri Ganapathy Hegde the learned Advocate for the I party however, submitted that the I party due to various reasons has behaved in the manner narrated above and he having realised that he does not have any sources of his livelihood has realised and therefore the benevolent provision of Section 11A may be extended in his favour.

11. We cannot find fault with the II party in dismissing the services of this workman. To this extent, we cannot question the Order of the management. But the fact remains that the I party was a Lower category workman in the II party bank. Infact their Educational qualification are 8th std. Their mental faculty depends on the environment and family background. Infact a tendency of this nature stated to be a very severe misconduct and therefore, the benevolent provisions should not be extended unless it is warranted.

12. Section 11A invested the power to the adjudicating authorities to examine the case resulted in the dismissal, discharge of the workman and find out any justification to hold such orders keeping in view the plight of the workman. While applying this provision the adjudicating authorities shall rely only materials on records and there is no scope for taking any fresh evidence in relying to this matter.

13. The settled principles of law is that once a Domestic Enquiry is held to be fair and proper the discussions on the report amounts to review, unless it is made out that the order is perverse order. We cannot hold that the report of the Enquiry Officer was perverse. However, the beneficial legislation in labour laws shall be extended in favour of the workman in given case when the misconduct does not amount to moral turpitude.

14. This workman is without any work since the date of his dismissal and he appears to have realised his folly when he understood that the order of dismissal brought an end to his life and also to his family members. Therefore, the earlier orders of minor punishment made no effect on this workman.

15. However, we have to examine this type of case objectively. There cannot be any settled principles when a case of this nature is examined. Therefore, I believe that the benevolent provision of Section 11A is required to be extended which will help a ruined workman to come to the normal life without burdens the Management to incur monitory expenses in this regard.

16. Infact in Mandeep Kumar and other v/s. State of Haryana and another (1996) 1-SC 292, the Supreme Court has given a fresh lease of life to a workman, in a similar circumstances.

17. Having regard to these facts and circumstance I made the following Order :

ORDER

18. Though the II party was justified in dismissing the services of the I party by exercising the power under Section 11A, the II party is directed to reinstate the I party to the post he was holding earlier. The punishment imposed against him prior to this misconduct will stand unaltered. The I party shall

be paid wages which he was drawing before the order of dismissal. He is not entitled for any back wages. If he remains absent unauthorisedly from duty without leave even on a single occasion during next 2 years the II party is at liberty to discharge him from the service. The reference is answered accordingly.

JUSTICE R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1999

कां०आ०-2605.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार केनरा बैंक के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बैंगलोर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय संस्कार को 16-8-99 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-12012/185/89-डी०-II (ए०)]

सी० गंगाधरण, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1999

S.O. 2605.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Canara Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-8-99.

[No. L-12012/185/89-D-II(A)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT BANGALORE

Dated the 5th August, 1999

PRESENT:

Justice R. Ramakrishna, Presiding Officer.

C.R. No. 61/89

I Party

Shri K. P. Venkata Reddy
Since deceased represented
by his legal heirs.

(1) Smt. K. C. Nanjamma, W/o
late K. P. Venkata Reddy,
aged about 60 years,

(2) K. V. Venugopala Reddy, S/o
late K. P. Venkata Reddy,
aged about 32 years,
Door No. 1,
8th Main, Ganesha Block,
(behind Vijaya Pharmacy)
Mahalakshimpura,
Bangalore-560 096.

II Party
The Deputy Manager
Canara Bank,
Bangalore Circle Office,
P.B. No. 5147, M.G. Road,
Bangalore-560 001.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2A of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-12012/185/89-D.II(A) dated 22nd August 1989 on the following schedule:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank in dismissing from service Shri K. P. Venkata Reddy is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The deceased first party joined the services of the second party bank as a probationary Clerk w.e.f. 12-2-1979. From 25-10-82 he was working as a special assistant at second party bank of HAL II Stage Branch. It was found that the first party had indulged in various acts of gross mis-conduct resulting in heavy loss to the Bank. Therefore, the second party Bank has decided to initiate disciplinary action as contained in Chapter XI of the Canara Bank Service Code. A charge sheet dated 13-1-87 was issued on the following grounds:—

- (a) that Shri K. P. Venkata Reddy (First party) while he was working as Spl. Asst. at Canara Bank, HAL II Stage Branch, Bangalore, passed a cheque bearing No. 5483162 in the Current Account ledger of M/s. Reckitt and Colman India Limited which was missing from the cheque book issued to the company (bearing Nos. 5483101 to 200). The said cheque purported to have been issued by the company for Rs. 1,90,000 was received in clearing on 1-1-86 being presented by Bank of Baroda, K.C. Road, Bangalore-9.
- (b) the said cheque, which was forged with a false seal of the Company was passed by the First Party negligently without verifying the specimen signatures of the authorised signatories of the company, lodged with the Bank.
- (c) the First party violated the standing instructions given by the Company regarding authority conferred on the officers of the company fixing financial ceiling by passing the said cheque which was purported to have been signed by officers who were not at all authorised to draw beyond Rs. 3,000.
- (d) the First party also exceeded the financial powers given to him in the capacity of Spl. Asst. and passed the cheque for Rs. 1,90,000 which was beyond his powers. His negligent action is resulted in financial loss to the Bank to the extent to Rs. 1,90,000.

3. The above acts amounted to misconduct under Chapter XI Regulation 3(i) and 3(mm) of the Canara Bank Service Code.

4. An Enquiry Officer was appointed to conduct a domestic enquiry on the allegations of charge. The domestic enquiry was conducted by the Enquiry Officer in accordance with law. This Tribunal has already given a finding on the validity of domestic enquiry. After this issue being agitated by the first party, the procedures were examined and this Tribunal held that the second party have conducted the domestic enquiry in accordance with law. In view of this finding the advocates were directed to address the arguments on merits.

5. The law is well settled if a domestic enquiry is held to be fair and proper, the next stage for the Tribunal to examine that the findings of the Enquiry Officer was not perverse, the management are not guilty of victimising the workman under unfair labour practice.

6. We have explained the charges levelled against this workman briefly. To prove this mis-conduct, the management cited 6 witnesses and they have examined altogether 5 witnesses. The specimen signature cards of the authorised signatories to the cheques issued by M/s. Reckitt and Colman India Ltd., are also exhibited. In addition to this the management also marked as many as 16 documents excluding the statement of the witnesses. In fact the disputed and admitted cheque leaves of the account holder were also produced and marked as Exhibits. Inter alia the Enquiry Officer on the basis of the materials, both oral and documentary, produced by the management, the Enquiry Officer came to the conclusion that the deceased workman was responsible for causing a loss to the bank to the extent of Rs. 1,90,000 due to his negligence and other acts which are not entrusted to him. The Enquiry Officer also came to the conclusion that the said cheque book issued, from which, a cheque leaf bearing No. 5483162 was removed and the same was utilised for this purpose. The cheque book was issued by the deceased workman. On the day of clearing this cheque alongwith other cheques received from other banks for payment, the deceased workman failed to notice a glaring difference in almost all the features of the cheque and also he has deliberately failed to observe that the signatory to that cheque are not the competent persons as per the list furnished by M/s. Reckitt and Colman India Ltd, and also the first party has showed his ignorance of not observing the manner of seals put to the cheque in question. He has also exceeded his limit in not showing the said cheque to the manager before clearing. Therefore, the materials prima facie proved the allegation of charges against the workman and therefore, the Enquiry Officer found him guilty in his report.

7. The learned advocate for the deceased workman is unable to point out that the report of the Enquiry Officer is a perverse order. The only submission made by the learned advocate is that this workman died in the year 1997 and since there was no evidence that he was also involved in missing this amount the order of dismissal is not in consonance to the gravity of the offence. Therefore, it is prayed by the advocate that the benevolent provisions of Section 11A may be extended in favour of the deceased workman.

8. I am unable to concede to the submissions made by the learned advocate. The acts committed by this workman is deliberate. It is not an accident. If we

analyse the events that took place one after another there cannot be any impediment to held that the deceased workman has committed this offence with eyes opening with a clear conscience the penalty is required to be paid for this offence. Therefore, the benevolent provisions contained under Section 1A cannot be extended to a case of this nature. Taking into consideration of past records also not necessary in the cases of this nature, as the gravity of the offence is very serious. A Bank employee shall observe maximum honesty and integrity in discharging his duties. If he failed to observe this basic principles he is not entitled to work as a bank employee.

9. Having regard to these facts and circumstances, the punishment imposed by the management is not shockingly disproportionate, thereby any interference is necessary. In the result I make the following order:—

ORDER

The second party are justified in dismissing the late Venkata Reddy for the proved misconduct. The reference is answered accordingly.

JUSTICE R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2606—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, भोपाल के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर (एम. पी.) के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-08-1999 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संध्या एल.—12012/123/90—आई आर (जी यू. .) बी. 1]

जी. राय, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2606.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur (M.P.) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India, Bhopal and their workman which was received by the Central Government on Bhopal.

.. Workman

[No. L-12012/123/90-IR(D.U.)/B.I.]

G. ROY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT JABALPUR (M.P.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SHRI D. N. DIXIT

CASF NO: CGIT/LC(R) 189/90

Shri Shyam Singh Chauhan,
S/o Shri Girdhari Singh,
164, Rajendranagar Colony,
Bhopal.

Management

V/s

The Regional Manager,
Region I,
State Bank of India,
Hamidia Road,
Bhopal.

MANAGEMENT

AWARD

Delivered on this 29th day of July 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No: L-12012/123/90 I.R. (D.U.), dated 21-9-90 referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the State Bank of India, Region I, Bhopal in retrenching Shri Shyam Singh Chauhan, ex-messenger, w.e.f. 1-2-85 without complying with the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The case of the workman is that he worked with the management from 24-12-83 till 31-1-85. His services were terminated on 31-1-85. He was appointed against a clear vacancy and termination is therefore illegal. He has been terminated without notices and without payment of retrenchment compensation. People much junior to him are still working, as such this retrenchment is illegal. After termination of service the workman contacted the management on various occasion but the management did not listen to him. Looking to the facts and circumstances of the case the workman wants the order of termination be quashed and back wages and allowances paid from 1-2-85.

3. The case of the management is that the workman has not worked for 240 days with the management. From December, 1983 to March, 1985 in broken periods the workman has worked as a casual labour in the post of Chowkidar, Waterman, Messenger and Hamaal. He has been paid wages at the rate of daily wage employee. The workman was never appointed for any particular post. The removal of the workman was not retrenchment. He was given chance to appear to permanent absorption in the management but he failed in the interview.

4. The management submits that since the applicant did not complete 240 days of working during the preceding year, he is not entitled to invoke the provisions of the I.D. Act. He was not appointed to any particular post but he was a casual worker working at different post. His contract was not renewed after 31-1-85. Further he was given a chance to appear in the interview for permanent employment. In this interview he failed. The prayer of the management is that the workman is neither entitled to reinstatement nor to back wages.

5. The first argument advanced by the workman is that the reference speaks about the retrenchment of the workman without complying the provision of Section 25 (F). Thus according to workman the position as stated in the reference speaks of two things. Firstly there is a retrenchment of the workman. Secondly the provision of section 25(F) of the ID Act has not been complied by the management. The argument of the workman is that these two things are accepted then nothing remains to be adjudicated. This Court has no other option but to give award in favour of the workman. I do not agree that I have no other option but to give the award in the favour of workman. According to the language of the reference, there is no pre supposition that the workman was retrenched. The appropriate Government had no evidence that the workman has worked for 240 days before the termination preceding the calendar year. Thus the appropriate Government could not presume that the workman was retrenched.

The wording of the reference is unfortunate and without application of mind. It is expected that proper care shall be taken by Ministry of Labour in framing the reference.

6. The management witness Shri Arun Kumar Degweker, Chief Manager, Office Administration, Zonal Office, Bhopal has stated in para 2 of his affidavit that Ex M 1 states the details of working days of the workman. Ex M 1 states that in 1983 the workman worked for 5 days, in 1984 217 days, 1985 23 days. Thus the total period of work done by the workman from 24-12-83 to 31-1-85 is 245 days. This fact is further made clear by the documents filed by the management Ex. M 2. It is amply clear that the break in service of the workman is artificial. Thus I find that the workman has worked for 245 days prior to termination of his service and the termination of his service is retrenchment.

7. Admittedly the workman has not been given notice of termination and retrenchment compensation. Thus there is violation of 25 (F) of the ID Act.

8. The argument advanced by the learned counsel for management is that the workman was given an opportunity to face the Selection Committee and he was interviewed. The workman was not selected for the job. The letter sent to workman is Ex M 3. Thus as the workman was not found fit he cannot be forced to join the service of management. I do not agree with this argument. By virtue of working with the management the workman was given the opportunity to face the Selection Committee in which he failed. This does not mean that his position of a workman as defined in the ID Act has made a difference. This right of the workman cannot be taken away by another right that is Selection by Interview Committee. The workman is entitled to remain in job because he has put up more than 240 days of service in the bank. The workman was invited to face the Interview Committee. From the fact it is clear his work and conduct was upto the mark. The workman was not terminated because he has any deficiency in his character or conduct. The workman was terminated arbitrarily by the management from 1-2-85. He was all the time trying to work for the management. Thus the workman is entitled for wages from 1-2-85 till date.

9. The award is given in favour of the workman. His termination order dated 31-1-85 is hereby quashed. He would be deemed to be in service. He would be paid wages and allowances from 1-2-85 onwards. The payment be made within three months of the award. If this is not done the management will pay to workman interest at the rate of 12 per cent p.a. Management to pay Rs. 2000/- as cost of this case to workman.

10. Copy of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

का. अ. 2607:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जम्मू एंड कश्मीर बैंक लिमिटेड, के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचपट की प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-08-1999 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12011/19/94—आई आर (बी. II)
(बी. I)]

जी. रॉय, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2607.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award

of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jammu & Kashmir Bank Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-1999.

[No. L-12011/19/94-IR(B.II)(B.I)]

G. ROY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) 83/96

Shri Dharamnarayan Purohit,
Represented through The Vice President,
Madhya Pradesh Bank
Karamchari Sangh,
37, Bakshi Gali,
Indore (M.P.) ... Union

V/s.

The Branch Manager,
Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd.,
Babadeep Complex, 1st Floor,
Maharani Road,
Siyaganj,
Indore (M.P.) ... Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 4th August, 1999

1. The Government of India Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12011/19/94-I.R.(B. II), dated 19-3-96 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Jammu & Kashmir Bank Ltd., Indore in terminating the service of Sh. Dharamnarayan Purohit, Peon-cum-watchman is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The contention of the workmen is that he was engaged as a peon by Order dated 2-1-89 in the Indore Branch. The workman ascerts that he has worked against a permanent vacancy. His services were terminated from 4-5-92. Artificial breaks were given in his continuous service. The workman wants his re-employment from 4-5-92 onwards and wages and allowances.

3. On 7-11-97 Shri Devendra Singh, Manager appeared for the management and noted the next

date of hearing i.e. 17-4-98. On 17-4-98, 12-6-98, 24-9-98 and 11-2-99 the management did not appear. They were proceeded ex parte.

4. The workman filed his affidavit in support of his contention. This is supported by documents filed by the workman. The workman has stated in the affidavit that he has continuously worked in the Indore Branch of the Bank from 29-12-88 to 4-5-92. The document filed by him also reveals that he has been engaged continuously and the break in service is artificial.

5. The Branch Manager, Indore has written to Chief Manager Personal on 30-12-91 that the services of the workman be regularised. It also mentions that the workman is working with the bank for the last three years. It also mentions that the work which the workman was doing exist.

6. The Branch Manager wrote another letter to Deputy General Manager on 27-3-91 again recommending that the services of workman be regularised.

7. The Branch Manager wrote another letter to Area Manager on 18-9-91 requesting that the services of the workman be regularised as there is need of his services. He has further written that he is fully competent to be absorbed in Bank Service.

8. The documents reveal that the Branch Manager wanted that the workman be absorbed in permanent post. The work in the Branch justify this request. The conduct and character of the workman was upto the mark.

9. The workman has given the number of days he worked for the bank in para 5 of his Statement of Claim. This clearly shows that the workman has worked for more than 240 days in the year 1990 and 1991. The break in service was artificial. The termination of the service of the workman was a retrenchment as defined under section 2(oo) of the I.D. Act. The workman has not been paid retrenchment compensation and salary in lieu of notice. Thus retrenchment of the workman is illegal under section 25(f) of the I.D. Act.

10. The Award is given in favour of the workman. The order of termination dated 4-5-92 is hereby quashed. He will deemed to be in service of the management from 4-5-92 onwards. As he has been removed without any reason or cause he is entitled to wages from 4-5-92 continuously. This amount be paid to workman in three months time from date of publication of the Award. If this is not done the workman will be entitled to interest @ 12% p.a. till the payment is made. The management is directed to pay Rs. 2000/- as cost to the workman.

11. Copies of the Award be sent to Ministry of Labour Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1999

का. प्रॉ. 2608—प्रोद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, नागपुर के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निोजक और उनके कार्यकारी के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट प्रोद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रोद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर (एम. पी.) के पक्षों को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-08-1999 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12011/66/88-डी-1 (बी)/बी. 1]

जी. राय, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1999

S.O. 2608.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Reserve Bank of India, Nagpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-8-1999.

[No. L-12011/66/88-D-1 (B)/B. I]

G. ROY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT/LC (R)/88/89

The Secretary,
Reserve Bank of India
Employees Association,
C/o R. B. I.
Nagpur (M.P.)

... Union

V/s.

The Manager,
Reserve Bank of India,
Nagpur. (M.P.)

... Management.

AWARD

Delivered on this 26th day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12011/66/88-DI(B) dated 28-4-89 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the Reserve Bank of India, Nagpur justified in stopping the special pay of

Data Entry Operators S/Shri J. N. Gajhate, S. S. Ratan and W. R. Jamgade on their promotion of Grade I Clerks? If not to what relief the workman concerned are entitled to?"

2. According to the Union a Computer Section was started and Clerks Grade II were invited to appear to the aptitude test. Those who qualified in the test were trained in the operation of the computers. After completion of the training these employees were posted as Data Entry Operators. Some of these employees were promoted as Clerk Grade I. As Clerk Grade II these employees were getting special pay. On promotion to Clerk Grade I this Special Pay was withdrawn. Thus on promotion the wages of the employees were reduced. Various application were made to the Manager and Chief Manager but this anomaly was not resolved. Hence this Industrial Dispute has been raised. The Union wants many things but the reference relates to the point whether the Special Pay drawn by the Clerks Grade II in Computer Section can be stopped on promotion as Clerks Grade I. Thus award will deal with only this point.

3. The Contention of the management is that the reference is devoid of merit and is liable to be rejected. From the day the application were invited from Clerk Grade II it was made clear that for the work in Computer Section they would be paid a Special Pay along with salary and other allowances. This allowance were paid to the these Clerks working in the Computer Section. This was a functional pay admissible to the Clerks II performing a particular type of job. This Special Pay was not admissible to the employees during the period of leave. On promotion from Clerks Grade II to Clerks Grade I the employees shifted from Computer Section. Thus the employees getting promotion cases to function as Data Entry Operators and as a consequence the Special Pay is stopped. According to the management everything was done as per rules. A Special Pay cannot be given on promotion to Clerk Grade I.

4. When the management started Computer Section it invited application from Clerks Grade II and those who passed the aptitude test were trained in the operation of Computers. On successful completion of the training they were posted as Data Entry Operators and a Special Pay was given to them. There was no promotion avenue in the Computer Section. Hence when as Clerks Grade II the employees were due for promotion as Clerks Grade I, the Data Entry Operators were considered and promoted. The Special Pay they were getting as Data Entry Operators was stopped because they were not working on promotion as Data Entry Operators. The grievance of the employees is that on promotion their emoluments were reduced. The Union wants that this Special Pay be continued to be paid even on promotion as Clerks Grade I.

5. The arguments advanced by the Union are not logical as the employees promoted as Clerks Grade I were not working as Data Entry Operators, they could not be paid the Special Pay assigned to this work. This Special Pay were given to Clerks Grade II promoted from Data Entry Operators Computer Section as Data Entry Operators. As soon as they cease to work in such a capacity they have no claim on the Special Pay.

6. In the case the demand of the Union is accepted then there will be disparity between the Clerks Grade II promoted from Data Entry Operators more than normal Clerks Grade I.

7. As Data Entry Operators the Employees could be withdrawn from Computer Section and posted to other Sections. There was no understanding or assurance that they will remain only in Computer Section. The initial recruitment of Data Entry Operators was as Clerks Grade-II. Thus on being posted to other Section even as Clerks Grade II they would not have received Special Pay. Thus even in other posting of Clerks Grade II as (Data Entry Operators) could not have received Special Pay.

8. The Special Pay paid to Data Entry Operators was for the work in Computer Section. As soon as this work is stopped the Special Pay also stopped.

9. The above situation does not mean reduction in pay scale of Data Entry Operators was that of Clerks Grade II. This has not been reduced on promotion as Clerks Grade I. What has been withheld is Special Pay. Thus the demand of Union is devoid of rules and principles of natural justice. The management was justified in stopping the Special Pay as soon the employees were transferred from Computer Section.

10. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

11. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2609—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल रेलवे, जबलपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधीकरण, जबलपुर (एम. पी.) के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-08-1999 को प्राप्त हुआ था ।

[संख्या एन-41012/140/92-आई आर (डी. यू.)/बी. 1]

जी. राय, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1999

S.O. 2609.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur (M.P.) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Railway, Jabalpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-08-1999.

[No. L-41012/140/92-IR(DU)|B. I]

G. ROY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Presiding Officer : Shri D. N. Dixit.

Case No. CGIT|LC|(R) (17)/94

Shri Shrikant Sharma,
S/o Shri Madhav Prasad Sharma,
H. No. 2660,
Kamala Nehru Nagar,
(Near Telegraph Gate No. 2),
Jabalpur (M.P.)

Workman

V/s.

The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway,
Jabalpur(M.P.)

Management

AWARD

Delivered on this 22nd day of July, 1999

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. 41012/140/92-IR(DU) dated 31-1-84 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Divisional Railway Manager, Central Railway, Jabalpur in terminating services of Shri Shrikant Sharma, Ex Casual Labour w.e.f. 20-7-90 is justified? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?”

2. The workman Shrikant Sharma was a Railway Casual Labour at Staff Canteen Jabalpur. He was working for 18-3-85 till 20-7-90. During the period of his service all the benefits had been levied to Railway servant was given to the workman. Before termination of services the workman was not given a notice of retrenchment compensation as per provisions of Section 25 of I.D. Act. Thus the retrenchment of the workman is bad in law. The services

of the workman had been terminated without any reason or cause. The work which the workman was doing is still exist. The persons junior to the workman continue in the services of Railway and even new appointment were made. The prayer of the workman is that order dated 20-7-90 be quashed and it be declared that he is still in service. The workman also claims back wages and allowances.

3. The contention of the management is that Railway never engaged the workman. The Staff Canteen is not owned by Central Railway Jabalpur. The management does not control the affairs of the Staff Canteen. The workman was not a Railway Employee. According to management the claim of the workman is false and frivolous and it be dismissed with cost.

4. The arguments advanced by the Advocate of the workman is that the Central Railway Staff Canteen Jabalpur is a subsidised canteen and according to the decision of Supreme Court, the Ministry of Railways has decided that the employee of said canteen should be treated as railway employee w.e.f. 1-4-90. The entire running of the canteen including the work of employees is under the supervision and control of Railway Administration. Thus the relationship of Employer and Employee is there between workman and management. The said canteen is maintained for the use of employee of Central Railway Division Jabalpur and it becomes a part of the DRM establishment.

5. The arguments given by the management are that where is no relationship between the workman and management of employer and employee. As such the workman cannot get any relief from management.

6. The workman was not employed by the management. His services further has not been terminated by the management. As stated by the workman his work was supervised by the manager of canteen. He was paid wages by the manager.

7. The witness of the workman Shri K. K. Sharma has stated in cross examination that the workman has not been appointed by the Railway. The termination order has not been given by the Railways. The payment of the wages was made by the Canteen Manager.

8. The workman has to establish that the canteen in which he was working was a non statutory recognised Canteen of the Indian Railways. The workman has not filed a document showing that this Canteen was a Recognised Canteen of the Indian Railways. The workman has not shown the nature of the canteen in which he was working. It is not clear from his Statement of Claim whether this canteen was run by a private contractor or by Co-operative Society of the Railway Employees. It has also not stated that the customers were only Railway

Employees. Thus the workman failed to prove that he was working in a canteen and this canteen was recognised by the Indian Railways. The consequences of this is that the management has no role to play in affairs of the employment of the workman.

9. The workman miserably failed to prove the liability of the management in the present case. The Award is given in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. Copies of the award be sent to Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rule.

D. N. DIXIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2610 औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) और (2) में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की दूसरी सूची में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी भी मामले से संबंधित औद्योगिक विवादों के न्यायनिर्णयन और ऐसे अन्य कार्यों का निष्पादन करने के लिये जो उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत सौंपे जा सकते हैं, एतद्वारा श्रम न्यायालय का गठन करती है जिसका मुख्यालय नागपुर में होगा और श्री बी.जी. मखसेना को दिनांक 1 जलाई, 1999 (पूर्वाह्न) से उस न्यायालय का पीठासीन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. ए-11016/2/98-CLS-III]

पी.पी. मित्रा, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 25th August, 1999

S.O. 2610.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with headquarters at Nagpur and appoints Shri B. G. Saxena as the Presiding Officer of the Tribunal, with effect from 1st July, 1999 (F.N.).

[F. No. A-11016/2/98-CLS-III]

P. P. MITRA, Director

नई दिल्ली, 30 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 1611.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) और (2) में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की दूसरी सूची में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी भी मामले से संबंधित औद्योगिक विवादों के न्यायनिर्णयन और ऐसे अन्य कार्यों का निष्पादन करने के लिए जो उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत सौंपे जा सकते हैं, एतद्वारा श्रम न्यायालय का गठन करती है जिसका मुख्यालय लखनऊ

में होगा और श्री रुद्रेश कुमार को दिनांक 15 जून, 1999 (पूर्वाह्न) से उस न्यायालय का पीठासीन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. ए-1201/5/99-सी. एल. एस.-II]

पी. पी. मित्रा, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th August, 1999

S.O. 2611.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes Labour Court with headquarters at Lucknow for the adjudication of industrial disputes relating to any matter specified in the Second Schedule to the said Act and for performing such other functions as may be assigned to it under the said Act, and appoints Shri Rudresh Kumar as Presiding Officer of that Court with from 15th June, 1999 (F.N.).

[F. No. A-12011/5/99-CLS. II]

P. P. MITRA, Director

नई दिल्ली, 30 अगस्त, 1999

का. आ. 2612.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) और (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण का गठन करती है, जिसका मुख्यालय लखनऊ में होगा और श्री रुद्रेश कुमार को दिनांक 15 जून, 1999 (पूर्वाह्न) से न्यायाधिकरण का पीठासीन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. ए-12011/5/99-सी. एल. एस.-II]

पी. पी. मित्रा, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th August, 1999

S.O. 2612.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with headquarters at Lucknow and appoints Shri Rudresh Kumar as the Presiding Officer of the Tribunal with effect from 15th June, 1999 (F.N.).

[F. No. A-12011/5/99-CLS. II]

P. P. MITRA, Director